Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 305

Silvia Schroer / Patrick Wyssmann (eds)

Images in Transition

The Southern Levant and Its Imagery between Near Eastern and Greek Traditions

PEETERS

IMAGES IN TRANSITION

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Founded by Othmar Keel

Editorial Board: Susanne Bickel, Catherine Mittermayer, Mirko Novák,
Thomas C. Römer and Christoph Uehlinger

Published on behalf of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies and the Bible+Orient Foundation

in cooperation with
the Institute of Egyptology, University of Basel,
the Institute of Archaeological Sciences, Near Eastern Archaeology section, University of Bern,
the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg,
the Institut romand des sciences bibliques, University of Lausanne,
and the Department of Religious Studies, University of Zurich

Volume editors

Silvia Schroer (*1958) is professor emerita for Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern Cultures at the Faculty of Theology, University of Bern.
Email: silvia.schroer@unibe.ch

Patrick Wyssmann (*1977) is a lecturer for Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern Cultures at the Faculty of Theology, University of Bern.
Email: patrick.wyssmann@unibe.ch

Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 305

Images in Transition

The Southern Levant and Its Imagery between Near Eastern and Greek Traditions

edited by

Silvia Schroer and Patrick Wyssmann

Peeters
Leuven - Paris - Bristol, CT
2024

Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis publishes monographs, multi-author volumes and conference proceedings in the fields of Biblical Studies (Hebrew Bible and Septuagint), Ancient Near Eastern Studies and Egyptology broadly understood (including archaeology, history, iconography and religion). The editorial board and affiliated institutions reflect the series' high academic standards and interdisciplinary outlook. Manuscripts may be submitted via a member of the editorial board. They are examined by the board and subject to further peer review by internationally recognized scholars at the board's discretion. The series is committed to worldwide distribution, notably through open access publication (Gold or Green). Past volumes are archived at the digital repository of the University of Zurich (www.zora.uzh.ch).

Senior editor: Christoph.Uehlinger@uzh.ch

Cover illustration:

Bulla from Tel Kedesh, impressed with a seal showing the "Tanit" symbol and the epigraph *š ʾl hʾrṣ* "(He) who is over the land" (Herbert 2023: 363 Fig. 10.25; drawing: Ada Yardeni).

The open access publication of this book has been facilitated by the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-429-5441-0
eISBN 978-90-429-5442-7
D/2024/0602/79
© 2024, Peeters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage or retrieval devices or systems, without the prior written permission from the publisher, except the quotation of brief passages for review purposes.

CONTENTS

Preface VII
Introduction IX

Rolf A. Stucky
Sidon und die kulturellen Kontakte zu Griechenland während der Perserzeit 1

Hans-Peter Mathys and Rolf A. Stucky
The *Marzeaḥ* Inscription from Bostan esh-Sheikh (*Ph30*) 19

S. Rebecca Martin
The Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods at Tel Dor 41

Dalit Regev
Were Columbaria Used in Judah during the Late Iron Age? 70

Silvia Schroer
Göttin und Löwe – Eine dauerhafte Liaison 98

Thomas Staubli
God as a Child in the Southern Levant and Northern Egypt: Cultural Transition and Continuity in the Light of a Pictorial Motif of the *Longue Durée* 110

Christian Frevel and Katharina Pyschny
On Headgears, Beards, and Clothes: Reevaluating Typological Indicators in the Case of Southern Levantine Figurines from Persian and Early Hellenistic Times 162

Ulrich Hofeditz
Trade, Charm, or Cult? Bes Vases in the Southern Levant during the Persian Period 221

Philipp Frei
Götter in der Fremde – Überlegungen zu griechischen Motiven im hellenistischen Bildrepertoire des antiken Orients 237

Andrea M. Berlin and Sharon C. Herbert
Identity Writ Small: Seal Imagery in Seleucid Palestine 254

Index of Place Names 267

Contributors 271

PREFACE

The present volume originated in the international conference "Images in Transition. The Southern Levant and its imagery between Near Eastern and Greek pictoral traditions", held in November 2017 at the University of Bern (Switzerland) in the context of the project "The imagery of Palestine/Israel between East and West. A history of religion based on pictures from the Persian to the Hellenistic period". The idea was to bring together some of the best qualified specialists in matters related to the (religious) history of Ancient Israel and its material culture.

Editing this volume was admittedly a long, albeit fascinating journey and required considerably more time and work than originally planned. It would not have been possible without the collaboration of several people as well as the support of various institutions. First of all our thanks go to the workshop participants, including all contributors to the present volume who engaged with great interest in the questions and discussions related to the volume.

Furthermore, we owe sincere thanks to Kasia Langenegger and Philipp Frei for their help in organizing and running the conference. Special thanks go to Nancy Rahn from the University of Bern who put much effort into proofreading.

The conference was made possible through the Swiss National Science Foundation, the Fontes-Stiftung (Bern), the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies (SGOA) and the Burgergemeinde Bern. Their sponsorship is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, we are deeply grateful to Christoph Uehlinger for including the present volume in the OBO series and Marcia Bodenmann for her indispensable help in preparing this volume.

We hope that the volume will provide a forum for the ongoing debate on the material culture of the Southern Levant in the transitional phase between the Persian and the Hellenistic periods and that it might become a starting point for further research.

Silvia Schroer & Patrick Wyssmann
Bern, September 2024

The participants of the conference “Images in Transition” (from the back row to the front row):
Thomas Staubli, Florian Lippke, Becky Martin, Kasia Langenegger, Winfried Held, Hans-Peter Mathys;
Oren Tal, Christian Frevel, Julia Hertzer, Axel Knauf, Ulrich Hofeditz, Katharina Pyschny, Patrick Wyssmann;
Dalit Regev, Haim Gitler, Andrea Berlin, Adi Erlich, Silvia Schroer.
Missing: Philipp Frei and Rolf Stucky.

INTRODUCTION

The material culture of the Southern Levant between the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 3rd century BCE is characterized by changing traditions resulting from the adoption and adaptation of Persian and Greek cultural traits. These processes of influence and interference (we may call them Persianization or Hellenization) as well as the expressions of the own cultural identity were in the focus of our conference "Images in Transition. The Southern Levant and its imagery between Near Eastern and Greek pictoral traditions."

This volume collects a selection of presentations from the conference, showcasing the diversity of the discussed topics. The contributions consist of case studies that explore the cultural processes occurring during the transition from the Persian to the Hellenistic period from various perspectives. Starting with the material culture of the coast, particularly of Phoenicia, the papers examine different available "media" – such as figurines, seals, and sealings – as well as typical motifs. They provide an overview of the pictorial repertoire and the specific interactions between Eastern and Western symbol systems in the southern Levant during the period in question. The synthesis of these diverse perspectives offers a comprehensive understanding of this significant transitional period.[1]

The starting point for this volume is Phoenicia, which was in early contact and exchange with East and West. Rolf A. Stucky (*Sidon und die kulturellen Kontakte zu Griechenland während der Perserzeit*) demonstrates this using the example of Sidon. The Persian period was a heyday for the city-state, during which close contacts were maintained with both Greece and Persia. The article impressively demonstrates how relations with Greece in particular affected Sidon's material culture.

Hans-Peter Mathys and Rolf A. Stucky (*The Marzeaḥ Inscription from Bostan esh-Sheikh [Ph30]*) provide a profound insight into the ritual customs in the sanctuary of Eshmun in Bostan esh-Sheikh on the basis of a rediscovered inscription. The mention of a social and religious institution called *marzeaḥ* is of particular interest, as is the mention of Shamash alongside the deities Eshmun and Astarte, who are well documented in Bostan esh-Sheikh. It shows that the sun god held an important position in the sanctuary's pantheon.

S. Rebecca Martin (*The Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods at Tel Dor*) provides an overview of the finds and features at Tel Dor from the 5th to the 2nd

[1] The conference goes back to a comprehensive research project, see the preface and Silvia Schroer and Patrick Wyssmann, "The imagery of Palestine/Israel between East and West. A history of religions based on pictures from the Persian to the Hellenistic period," *HeBAI* 8 (2019): 184–202.

century BCE. The city of Dor flourished during the Persian period, as evidenced by a rich selection of imported objects and pictorial material. The conquest by Alexander in the 330s BCE marked the political transition from Achaemenid to Macedonian rule, but Dor does not appear to have been directly affected by this. The fortunes of Dor changed as a result of its transformation at the time of the First Syrian War and its besiege during two battles in the late 3rd and mid-2nd centuries BCE. A variety of images were part of daily life in early Hellenistic Dor, but they never again reached the scale and scope seen in the Persian period.

Following the first three contributions dealing with culture on the coast, Dalit Regev (*Were Columbaria Used in Judah during the Late Iron Age?*) turns to the material culture of the hinterland in her contribution. She presents several underground installations near Jerusalem, which are columbaria. The installations can be dated to the Late Iron Age. Traditionally columbaria in the Southern Levant are dated to the Hellenistic period. This inevitably leads to the question of the chronological setting of the columbaria phenomenon in the Ancient Near East and whether it might be expected earlier.

The subsequent contributions focus on iconographic topics. Silvia Schroer (*Göttin und Löwe – Eine dauerhafte Liaison*) uses two objects to show how the old iconographic connection between goddess and lion(s) continued beyond the Persian period into the Hellenistic period. It is a good example of the longevity of certain pictorial traditions, which may change but remain intact at their core, and which may have had an impact on choice and preference of images in later periods.

Thomas Staubli (*God as a Child in the Southern Levant and Northern Egypt: Cultural Transition and Continuity in the Light of a Pictorial Motif of the Longue Durée*) provides a further example of the longevity of pictorial traditions, and how their meaning was changed and adapted. The motif of the divine child in visual art is at the center of interest and is traced through time and its enormous spread on the basis of its three main functions, which are: the endangered child (medical relevance), the savior-child (political relevance), and the cosmic child (theological relevance).

The comprehensive contribution by Christian Frevel and Katharina Pyschny (*On Headgears, Beards, and Clothes: Reevaluating Typological Indicators in the Case of Southern Levantine Figurines from Persian and Early Hellenistic Times*) focuses on two types of terracotta figurines, the so-called bearded man and the woman and child figurines. In doing so, they ask whether an East-West paradigm is appropriate and they attempt to diversify the findings in the direction of regional and temporal continuities or discontinuities. By discussing the notion of Hellenization against the background of the concept of hybridity, this contribution aims at a more reasonable typological approach beyond dichotomies.

The contribution by Ulrich Hofeditz (*Bes Vases in the Southern Levant during the Persian Period: Trade, Charm, or Cult?*) focuses on a special type of vessel, the so-called Bes vases. All pieces found in the Southern Levant are presented together with their find context and contrasted with comparative pieces from Egypt. This provides a clearer picture of the iconographic significance and the function of these special vessels.

Philipp Frei (*Götter in der Fremde – Überlegungen zu griechischen Motiven im hellenistischen Bildrepertoire des antiken Orients*) devotes his paper to the question of whether and how pictorial traditions from East and West were adapted, combined and further developed after Alexander the Great. As an example to answer this question, the author uses pictorial testimonies of Aphrodite. They reveal that the diverse pictorial material from the Hellenistic East must always be viewed and analyzed against the background of the regional cultures.

The last contribution in the volume focuses on Hellenistic culture of the 2nd century. Andrea M. Berlin and Sharon C. Herbert (*Identity Writ Small: Seal Imagery in Seleucid Palestine*) discuss the meanings conveyed by impressions from three rings, found among almost 2000 such sealings from a mid-second century BCE archive at Tel Kedesh in northern Israel. Each of them presents a different pictorial mode and indicates a different cultural milieu. In this way, according to the authors, they show how people at that place and time represented themselves individually and collectively.

The final paper in this volume reiterates a central theme of many contributions. The representation of persons and groups was, on the one hand, shaped by various cultures and influenced by them, whether from the East or the West. On the other hand, identity and its expression were sought, and apparently the adopted forms of expression often masked their own longstanding traditions. These traditions, despite numerous changes, exhibit a continuity, generally well-known and supposed, when we deal with ancient cultures, but yet in many cases also amazing and surprising. If the diverse contributions in this volume reveal anything about the transformative processes during the discussed transitional period, it is that the culture of the southern Levant in the Hellenistic period can only be fully understood in the context and on the background of the Persian and earlier periods. Not only by new finds, but also by working on questions and observations on already well published material, there are still treasures to be unearthed concerning the respective centuries of the southern Levant. We hope that the articles in our volume will be an inspiration and motivation to join the big task.

SIDON UND DIE KULTURELLEN KONTAKTE ZU GRIECHENLAND WÄHREND DER PERSERZEIT

Rolf A. Stucky

The epoch of Achaemenid rule over Phoenicia marked the beginning of a new prosperous time especially for Sidon. Ever since the 6th century BCE, not just the royal courts but also wealthy merchants commissioned imports of Greek marble originating initially from the Cycladic islands and in subsequent times from Attika. Around 380/360 BCE, the imported marble was utilized by Sidonians to build a new temple for Eshmun and to create sculptures of small children devoted to the healing god. Moreover, during that period iconographic and stylistic tendencies of Iran and Greece influenced the local cultural tradition.

In enger Anlehnung an die Vorgaben der Berner Tagung stehen die königliche Architektur und die Votivplastik im Zentrum meiner Analyse der kulturellen und religiösen Situation Sidons während der Perserherrschaft. Fundorte sind einerseits der „College site" innerhalb des Stadtgebiets und andererseits das extraurbane Heiligtum des jugendlichen Heilgottes Eschmun, dessen heiliger Bezirk mitten in der üppigen landwirtschaftlichen Zone der „Bostan esh-Sheikh" liegt. Die Ortsbezeichnung „Gärten des Scheichs" verweist auf die ehemaligen Besitzer der Gärten, den bedeutenden Drusen-Clan der Joumblatt.

1. Die Ausgrabungen

1.1. *„College site"*

Ein paar Worte zu Ausgrabungen und Ausgräbern in Sidon: Da das moderne Saida direkt über der antiken Siedlung liegt, sind von Sidon-Stadt nur spärliche Spuren erhalten. Für umso bedeutender hielt man eine Gruppe von Fragmenten, die um 1880 beim Bau des amerikanischen Knaben-Colleges entdeckt worden war und in den Besitz des Direktors des College, Georges Ford, gelangte. Im 20. Jahrhundert wurden die Fragmente im Nationalmuseum von Beirut zu einem Doppelprotomenkapitell achämenidischen Typus (**Abb. 1**) und zu einer assyrischen Blattkranzbasis rekonstruiert (**Abb. 2**), zwei Teilen einer Säule von 12 bis

Abb. 1: Sidon, College site. Doppelprotomenkapitell achämenidischen Typus (Beirut Nationalmuseum, Photo: Pierre Amandry).

Abb. 2: Sidon, College site. Assyrische Blattkranzbasis (Beirut Nationalmuseum, Photo: Pierre Amandry).

14 m.[1] Auch nach dem Abbruch des namengebenden Schulgebäudes behielt der Ort sein ursprüngliches Toponym „College site“. Seit 1998 untersucht eine Gruppe von libanesischen und englischen Archäologen unter der Leitung von Claude Doumet-Serhal diese Zone und stieß dort bis in Schichten der Frühen Bronzezeit vor. 2010 entdeckten die Ausgräber ein weiteres Fragment einer Stierprotome.[2]

1.2. *Heiligtum des Eschmun*

Um 1900 tauchte im Kunsthandel eine Gruppe gleichlautender phönizischer Inschriften auf, welche die Bautätigkeit eines Königs Bodaschtart und dessen Sohn Yatonmilk zu Ehren Eschmuns rühmen.[3] Schnell war ihre Herkunft aus dem Heiligtum des Eschmun eruiert. Zwischen 1901 und 1904 legte Théodore Macridy Bey für die osmanische Antikenverwaltung Teile des monumentalen Bodaschtart-Podiums frei, aus dessen Kern die Bauinschriften stammen. Die Funde sind heute im Archäologischen Museum in Istanbul verwahrt.[4] 1963 begann der französische Archäologe Maurice Dunand mit der großflächigen Ausgrabung des Eschmunheiligtums.[5] An einen Abbruch seiner Grabungstätigkeit dachte er auch nach dem Ausbruch des libanesischen Bürgerkriegs im Jahre 1975 nicht. Während der Kriegsjahre leitete er gleichzeitig die Ausgrabungen von Sidon und von Byblos. Erst im Dezember 1979 zwangen ihn Auseinandersetzungen verfeindeter politischer Fraktionen, seine Aktivitäten in Sidon zu beenden. Mitten durch die Kriegswirren transportierte der Greis mit Hilfe seiner Frau Mireille die Funde aus dem alleinstehenden, unbewachten Grabungsdepot von Bostan esh-Sheikh in die – leider nur scheinbar sichere – Kreuzritterburg von Byblos; schwere Einzelstücke blieben im Heiligtum zurück.[6] Zu dem Zeitpunkt übertrug er mir die Publikation des Heiligtums. Um 1980 verschwanden

[1] Stucky 2004: 216–219, Fig. 1–4; Stucky 2009: 7–10, Taf. 1, Abb. 4.5; Stucky 2012: 1191–1193, Fig. 8–9.

[2] Zu den Ausgrabungen: Doumet-Serhal 2004; Doumet-Serhal 2013; das Fragment der Stierprotome: 9, Abb. 7; die perserzeitlichen Strukturen: 54, Abb. 53.

[3] Zuletzt Mathys 2005: 274.

[4] Macridy 1902; Macridy 1903; von Landau 1904; von Landau 1905; Ganzmann/van der Meijden/Stucky 1987.

[5] Ab Band 18, 1965 publizierte Maurice Dunand regelmäßig Grabungsberichte im *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth*.

[6] Stucky 1993: 69, Nr. 13, Taf. 6 (diese monumentale Statue sah ich 1995 im „Depot Dakerman“ in Sidon); 73, Nr. 47–49, Taf. 13; 74, Nr. 58–60, Taf. 15; 97, Nr. 182, Taf. 41; 108, Nr. 242, Taf. 57; zudem die figürlich verzierten Bauelementen: Stucky et al. 2005: 211, Nr. A6–A8, Taf. 1; 227–228, Nr. C14.C16, Taf. 16–17 sowie die beiden Fragmente von Basen: 225, Nr. C1–C2, Taf. 14.



Abb. 3: Sidon, Bostan esh-Sheikh. Tempel des 4. Jahrhunderts,
Rekonstruktion der Längsseite (Zeichnung: Sigmund Stucky).



Abb. 4: Sidon, Bostan esh-Sheikh. Tempel des 4. Jahrhunderts,
Rekonstruktion des Längsschnittes (Zeichnung: Sigmund Stucky).

allerdings annähernd 95% der inzwischen in Byblos eingelagerten rund sechshundert Skulpturen. Seit 1991 tauchen vereinzelte Werke im europäischen und amerikanischen Kunsthandel und Privatbesitz wieder auf. Bisher gelang es, rund ein Dutzend Statuen und Reliefs ins Nationalmuseum von Beirut zurückzubringen.

2. Die Architektur

2.1. *„College site“*

Um die Lücken zwischen den erwähnten Fragmenten des Doppelprotomenkapitells (**Abb. 1**) und der assyrischen Blattkranzbasis (**Abb. 2**) zu kaschieren, übertünchten die Restauratoren des Nationalmuseums beide Bauteile mit grauem Zement. Dieser Überzug verleitete die Kenner antiker Architektur zur Hypothese, beide Bauteile seien aus lokalem Kalkstein gefertigt. Sie datierten die Basis ins 7. und das Kapitell ins 5. Jahrhundert. Erst Kollateralschäden im libanesischen Bürgerkrieg bewiesen, dass beide Bauteile nicht aus Kalkstein, sondern aus Marmor bestehen. Da in der gesamten Levante kein Marmor ansteht, mussten die Phönizier dieses Gestein aus Griechenland importieren. Aufgrund der Analysen durch Schweizer Petrographen unter der Leitung von Danielle Decrouez stammt der Marmor der Säule vom Pentelikon.[7] Der Beginn des Marmorabbaus in den attischen Steinbrüchen des Pentelikon im frühen 5. Jahrhundert widerspricht endgültig einer Frühdatierung der Basis ins 7. Jahrhundert. Somit entfällt das letzte Argument, Basis und Kapitell voneinander zu trennen. Beide sind Elemente von Säulen eines Pavillons aus der Epoche der Perserherrschaft, der späten Blütezeit der phönizischen Kultur. Die Höhe der Säulen betrug einst zwischen 12 und 14 m, was ungefähr jener der Säulen des Tripylon und des 100-Säulen-Saals auf der Terrasse von Persepolis entspricht.[8] Dennoch waren sie laut John Curtis, dem Bearbeiter der perserzeitlichen Schichten, nicht Teil des Baus von Typus „Apadana“, dessen Fundamente die Archäologen innerhalb des „College site“ freigelegt haben.[9] Nach Aussage von John Curtis sind die Interkolumnien für die weit ausladenden Doppelprotomenkapitelle zu schmal – insbesondere, wenn man die zu ergänzenden Hörner und Ohren der Stiere mit einrechnet.

[7] Decrouez/Ramseyer/Proz 2010: 358, Tab. 1, No 2081 (Säulenbasis); No 2078 (Doppelprotomenkapitell).

[8] Zu den Bauten auf der Terrasse von Persepolis: Schmidt 1953; Curtis/Razmjou 2005: 50–103; Knauss 2006: 98–113.

[9] John Curtis äußerte diese Zweifel in seinem Referat am Phönizier-Symposium „Three Global Harbors of the Ancient World: Tyre, Sidon, Byblos“ im Oktober 2017 in Beirut. Zur bisherigen Vorlage der perserzeitlichen Strukturen siehe Anm. 2.

Demnach stellt sich die Frage der Lokalisierung des königlichen Pavillons wiederum neu. Schon Charles Clermont-Ganneau hatte vermutet, die Säulen seien ursprünglich Teile einer Apadana im sidonischen Paradeisos gewesen, dem von Diodor (41, 5) erwähnten königlichen Jagd- und Landschaftspark, dessen genaue Lokalisierung nach wie vor umstritten ist.[10]

Grundriss und Aufbau des sidonischen Baus darf man sich wohl analog zu den achämenidischen Empfangsräumen und Wohnpalästen in Pasargadae, Persepolis und Susa vorstellen: Je nachdem, ob der Bau öffentlich oder privat genutzt wurde, öffneten monumentale Vestibüle auf einer einzigen, oder aber zwei, drei oder sogar vier Seiten den Zugang zum zentralen Saal. Wie in Persien waren sicher auch in Sidon die Säulen und die hölzerne Dachkonstruktion, die sie trugen, bunt bemalt.[11] Selbst wenn in Sidon nur ein einziges Vestibül mit vier Säulen dem Zentralraum vorgelagert war, musste für diesen pompösen Eingangstrakt eine enorme Tonnage pentelischen Marmors von Attika nach Phönizien verschifft werden.

2.2. *Heiligtum des Eschmun*

Rund ein halbes Jahrhundert nach dem Bau des königlichen Pavillons plante um 380 v.u.Z. wohl König Baalschillem II., Eschmun einen neuen Tempel zu errichten. Anhand meist nur noch in Photographien und Zeichnungen dokumentierter Fragmente rekonstruierte ich die äußere Gestalt des Tempels als ionischen Amphiprostylos (**Abb. 3**).[12] Da alle Bauelemente aus pentelischem Marmor bestanden, war der gesamte Tempel aus diesem aus Attika importierten, teuren Gestein errichtet.[13] Die Tatsache, dass bedeutende griechische Auftraggeber Marmor öfters nur für die Sima und für allfällige Giebelskulpturen bewilligten, für die restlichen Bauteile aber auf den billigeren Kalkstein zurückgriffen, betont den Reichtum und die Investitionsbereitschaft des sidonischen Bauherrn. Wenn mein Rekonstruktionsvorschlag zutrifft und sich das äußere Erscheinungsbild des Tempels an westlichen, griechischen Vorbildern orientierte, so verharrte der sakrale Bereich des Inneren, das Adyton, in orientalischer Tradition: Die Säulen standen auf assyrischen Blattkranzbasen und waren von Kapitellen mit vier Stierprotomen bekrönt. Entlang den Wänden trugen weitere Stierprotomen die

[10] Clermont-Ganneau 1921. Diskussion der bisherigen Lokalisierungsvorschläge des Pavillons: Stucky et al. 2005: 196–197. Wahrscheinlich war der Paradeisos auch der Schauplatz der Wahl von Abdalonymos zum König: Stucky 2017.

[11] Knauss 2006: 98–113 mit den Rekonstruktionen der farbig bemalten Architektur.

[12] Stucky et al. 2005: 54–85, Abb. 56–59. Vollendet wurde der Tempel wohl unter dem Nachfolger Baalschillem II., Abdaschtart II., den die Griechen Straton nannten und dem die Athener in den 60er Jahren des 4. Jahrhunderts die Proxenie verleihen: Elayi 2005.

[13] Möglicherweise bestanden die Wände der Cella aus Kalkstein. Für die Decke hatte man wohl das Zedernholz vom Libanongebirge verwendet.

Decke (**Abb. 4**).[14] Im Gegensatz zur harten und ornamentalen Ausführung der Stierköpfe des Pavillons (**Abb. 1**) gehen die einzelnen Partien der Tierkörper (**Abb. 5**) weich und nuanciert ineinander über; sie sind nicht additiv zusammengesetzt, sondern stärker als anatomische Einheit verstanden. Das kalkulierte Nebeneinander westlicher und östlicher Ingredienzien, welches die sidonische Kultur des 4. Jahrhunderts charakterisiert, manifestiert sich beim klassischen Tempel in der klaren Trennung zwischen dem äußeren gräzisierenden Erscheinungsbild und dem orientalisch geprägten Adyton.

3. Die Votivplastik

3.1. *„Temple-Girls" und „Temple-Boys"*

Der Import griechischen Marmors nach Sidon ist an und für sich nichts Außerordentliches; ähnlich gingen auch lykische und karische Potentaten für den Bau ihrer Anlagen vor – insbesondere Maussolos für seinen Grabbau in Halikarnassos und der bisher anonyme Auftraggeber des Nereidenmonuments in Xanthos.[15] Im Gegensatz zu den eher zurückhaltenden kleinasiatischen Prinzen beauftragten in Sidon nicht nur das Königshaus, sondern auch die reichen Kaufleute die Bildhauer, für ihre Votivskulpturen den besonders seltenen und dementsprechend teuren, Lychnites genannten Marmor aus Paros zu verwenden.[16] Ab rund 420 v.u.Z. präsentierten sich diese in Gestalt nackter Knaben und bekleideter Mädchen.[17] „Temple-Girls" und „Temple-Boys" kennt man auch aus griechischen Heiligtümern; dort treten sie allerdings erst eine bis zwei Generationen nach ihren phönizischen Geschwistern auf. Wegen der finanziellen Notsituation mussten sich die Griechen der Jahre um 400 v.u.Z. mit der Billigversion aus Terrakotta zufriedengeben; in Sidon aber gab es für eine finanzielle Zurückhaltung keinen Grund.

Zwei Altersstufen charakterisieren die marmornen Kinderfiguren: einerseits Sitzende, Kauernde oder Krabbelnde im Alter von maximal einem Lebensjahr (**Abb. 5–6**) und andererseits Stehende im Alter von rund drei bis fünf Jahren (**Abb. 7**), wobei die erste Gruppe zahlenmäßig weitaus die bedeutendere ist. Die stereotyp wiederholte Bitte der Votivinschriften lautet: „Er [Eschmun] möge

[14] Stucky et al. 2005: 104–138, Abb. 78–79, Taf. 16–19 (C14–C24).

[15] Walker/Hughes 2010: 445–451.

[16] Zu den Marmoranalysen der Skulpturen aus dem Eschmunheiligtum von Sidon: Decrouez/Ramseyer/Proz 2010; Stucky et al. 2016.

[17] Die Votivskulpturen des Eschmunheiligtums: Stucky 1993: speziell die Kinderstatuen: 29–39, Taf. 23–35.42–43.47–50.

Abb. 5: Sidon, Bostan esh-Sheikh. „Temple Girl“. Beirut Nationalmuseum
(Photo: Archives Maurice Dunand, Direction Générale des Antiquités, Beirut).

Abb. 6: Sidon, Bostan esh-Sheikh. „Temple Boy“. Beirut Nationalmuseum
(Photo: Archives Maurice Dunand, Direction Générale des Antiquités, Beirut).

Abb. 7: Sidon, Bostan esh-Sheikh. „Temple Boy“. Beirut Nationalmuseum
(Photo: Archives Maurice Dunand, Direction Générale des Antiquités, Beirut).

(sie) beschützen oder segnen."[18] Offensichtlich offerierte der Weihende die Kinderstatue mit dem bewussten Ziel ins Heiligtum, der Gott möge seine Nachkommenschaft gesund am Leben erhalten. Wenn Eltern gleichzeitig zwei Kinder unter den Schutz Eschmuns stellten, so schuf der Bildhauer eine Gruppe mit zwei Knaben und auch die Inschrift drückte den „Doppelwunsch" deutlich aus. Die beiden in den Statuen dokumentierten Altersstufen entsprechen zwei besonders kritischen Phasen im Leben der Kinder: Die Krabbelkinder veranschaulichen die Stufe der hohen Kindersterblichkeit im ersten Lebensjahr und die stehenden Knaben das Alter, in dem die sogenannten Kinderkrankheiten nochmals viele Opfer unter der Jugend fordern. Die Tatsache, dass die männliche Jugend die weibliche proportional bei weitem übertrifft, erklärt sich wohl durch die späteren Aufgaben der männlichen Nachkommen: Während die Töchter nach der Heirat aus ihrer eigenen Familie ausscheiden und in jene ihrer Ehemänner eintreten, sind die Söhne verpflichtet, sich um ihre alten Eltern zu kümmern. Deshalb war es so wichtig, Söhne zu zeugen, denn nur sie garantierten die Altersvorsorge der Eltern.

3.2. *„Tribune d'Echmoun"*

Zwei in ihrer absoluten Größe, in ihrem figürlichen Dekor und in ihrer künstlerischen und kulturellen Bedeutung herausragende Monumente sollen die Überlegungen zu Sidon in der Perserzeit abschließen: die sog. „Tribune d'Echmoun" (**Abb. 8–9**), ein Monument in Gestalt eines griechischen Altars *in antis*, und ein sog. „Astarte-Thron" (**Abb. 10**). Die am westlichen Fuß des Bodaschtart-Podiums entdeckte „Tribune d'Echmoun" nimmt in der Diskussion um den griechischen Einfluss in vorhellenistischer Zeit eine Schlüsselposition ein (**Abb. 8**).[19] Aufgrund des Fundzusammenhangs, des Figurenstils und der Ornamentik datiere ich die Tribune in die Jahre um 360 v.u.Z., noch vor die Einnahme Sidons durch Artaxerxes III. Vor dem Podest der Tribune grenzen Kalksteinblöcke einen kreissegmentförmigen Bereich ab, der an die Orchestra griechischer Theater erinnert.

Bei beiden Friesen bilden die Längs- und die beiden Schmalseiten eine thematische Einheit (**Abb. 9**): Oben die Versammlung der Götter, welche den Klängen Apolls lauschen und unten der Tanz der Nymphen. Dargestellt ist nicht das übliche Dutzend, sondern – den Kitharöden Apoll mitgerechnet – vierzehn Götter. Bei genauerer Zählung stellt man fest, dass die weiblichen Götter in krasser

[18] Mathys 2005: 275–295, Ph1–Ph3.Ph5. Besonders klar äußerte sich Abdmilk, der Türhüter, mit seiner Bitte Ph4: „Segne meine Nachkommenschaft, segne mich".

[19] Stucky 1984; Will 1985; Salamé-Sarkis 1987; Stucky 1993: 41–48.108–110, Nr. 247, Taf. 58–61; Bonnet 2013; Bonnet 2015: 231–245.

Abb. 8: Sidon, Bostan esh-Sheikh. „Tribune d'Echmoun", in situ
(Photo: Archives Maurice Dunand, Direction Générale des Antiquités, Beirut).

Überzahl sind: zehn Göttinnen stehen nur vier Göttern gegenüber. Da die einst angestückten Arme verloren sind, fällt in Ermangelung der göttlichen Attribute die Identifikation der Gottheiten nicht immer leicht. Die möglicherweise erst auf den zweiten Blick erkennbare, eher simple Komposition des oberen Frieses hilft bei der Suche nach den Götternamen weiter: Nach dem Gesetz der Symmetrie komponiert, setzt sich die Götterversammlung aus zwei zentralen Dreier-Gruppen mit sogenannt „gesenkter Mitte" und aus vier Paaren zusammen: Auf je ein stehendes Götterpaar an beiden Enden der Längsseite folgt auf den Schmalseiten je ein weiteres Paar mit einer sitzenden und einer stehenden Figur. Nach den Gesetzen der Symmetrie wenden sich auch die beiden rahmenden Viergespanne von der Versammlung ab, obwohl zu erwarten wäre, dass die linke Quadriga mit Helios als aufsteigender Sonne in Richtung der Götterversammlung fährt und nur die rechte mit Selene als sinkendem Mond sich von ihr entfernt. Die streng symmetrische Komposition der Götterversammlung ist wahrscheinlich ein Zugeständnis des griechischen Bildhauers an eine Grundtendenz phönizischer

Kunst, deren Werke seit Jahrhunderten ein Bildaufbau mit betonter Mittelachse prägt. Der Trias rechts der Mittelachse mit thronendem Zeus, gerahmt von Athena und Hera, entspricht auf der linken Seite die apollinische Trias mit dem Musikanten, der sitzenden Leto und der die Mutter bekränzenden Artemis. Die Fußstellung des Gottes am rechten Ende der Längsseite identifiziert ihn als Poseidon und seine Begleiterin zwangsläufig als Amphitrite. Das entsprechende Paar am linken Ende stellt wahrscheinlich Dionysos und Ariadne dar, auch wenn ich noch immer Mühe habe, in der matronalen Gestalt Ariadne zu erkennen. Hinter diesem Paar thront auf der linken Schmalseite Demeter; Persephone fasste mit der Hand des einst angestückten, erhobenen, rechten Arms wohl die Fackel. Als Namen des Paars auf der rechten Schmalseite schlage ich für die Sitzende Dione und für die Stehende Aphrodite vor.

Thema des unteren Frieses ist der ausgelassene Tanz der Nymphen, unter die sich ein Satyr gemischt hat. Zum Klang einer Wiegen-Kithara, eines Aulos und zu den Rhythmen von Krotalen bewegen sie sich einzeln oder zu einem Reigen vereint auf die Bildmitte zu.

Fanden in der Orchestra vor der „Tribune d'Echmoun" sakrale Tänze statt, wie dies der Nymphentanz suggeriert? Terrakotten mit Gruppen sich bei den Händen fassender, im Kreis tanzender Frauen aus unserem Heiligtum lassen vermuten, dass Sidonierinnen hier im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert tatsächlich Reigentänze aufführten;[20] die Figürchen erinnern entfernt an jene der Reigentänze aus der Nymphengrotte von Delphi.[21] Hier wie dort verehrte man diese flüchtigen Wesen in Grotten und in der Pflanzenwelt der freien Natur. Fließendes Wasser war integraler Bestandteil in Heiligtümern von Heilgöttern und gehörte ebenso unabdingbar zur Welt der Nymphen. Das in fast allen Votivinschriften wiederkehrende Toponym des Eschmunheiligtums lautet „an der Quelle YDL". Strabo (XVI,2, 22) bezeichnete unser Heiligtum denn auch als „τὸ τοῦ Ἀσκλεπίου ἄλσος", als heiligen Hain des Asklepios, was auf eine reiche Vegetation mit Sträuchern und Bäumen schließen lässt, wie sich Bostan esh-Sheikh einst vor dem Grabungsbeginn darbot.

Im Gegensatz zu den für den Hof geschaffenen königlichen Sarkophagen, die höchstens während der Trauerprozession des verstorbenen Herrschers kurz auch einem weiteren Publikum sichtbar waren, richteten sich die Votive primär an die Gottheit, standen aber den Gläubigen bei jedem Besuch von Bostan esh-Sheikh vor Augen. Wie vertraut waren die Sidonier mit dem griechischen Pantheon? Erkannten sie die griechischen Götter, deren Ikonographie so gar nichts mit der ihnen vertrauten göttlichen Bildwelt gemein hat und deren Benennung auch uns

[20] Ganzmann/van der Meijden/Stucky 1987: 96–101, Nr. 52–57, Abb. 1–2, Taf. 31. Zur Bedeutung des Tanzes im phönizischen Kult: Bonnet 2013; Bonnet 2015: 231–245.

[21] Pasquier 1977: Fig. 1.8.9 (Kestner-Museum Hannover).

noch immer vor Probleme stellt? War für die Sidonier des 4. Jahrhunderts das griechische mit dem phönizischen Pantheon schon deckungsgleich? Der Vorschlag von Père Jean Ferron, in den zehn weiblichen Gottheiten durchwegs unterschiedliche Aspekte oder Brechungen ein und derselben phönizischen Göttin, Astarte, zu sehen, geht m.E. an der Realität vorbei.[22] Ernest Will[23] und Corinne Bonnet[24] bot die Interpretation der Götterversammlung keine Schwierigkeit; sie gingen davon aus, dass einer breiteren Bevölkerungsschicht Sidons der pseudohomerische Apoll-Hymnus schon bestens bekannt war. Gibt es aber Indizien für eine so tiefgreifende Akkulturation Phöniziens mit der griechischen Mythologie in vor- oder allenfalls frühhellenistischer Zeit? Die Deutung der Bildwelt der



Abb. 9: Sidon, Bostan esh-Sheikh. „Tribune d'Echmoun". Rekonstruktion der beiden Friese (Beirut, National Museum. Photo: Archives Maurice Dunand, Direction Générale des Antiquités, Beirut).

[22] Ferron 1993: 352–364.
[23] Will 1985.
[24] Bonnet 2013; Bonnet 2015: 216–219.231–245, Abb. 39–44.

Tribune stellt uns noch immer vor Probleme, dies insbesondere deshalb, weil die beiden Bildzyklen – anders als die Sarkophagreliefs – keine gräzisierende Modeerscheinung höfischer Kunst widerspiegeln, sondern als Votiv im Heiligtum den Gläubigen stets zugängig waren.

3.3. *„Astarte-Thron“*

Der marmorne Astarte-Thron konfrontierte die Gläubigen mit dem Phänomen eines nur scheinbaren Anikonismus. Von den drei im Eschmunheiligtum entdeckten „Astarte-Thronen“ steht nur jener am Rand eines sakralen Wasserbeckens in seinem ursprünglichen kultischen Kontext. Er ruht auf einem hohen Podest in einer Nische der Rückwand der sog. „Piscine d’Astarté“ und nimmt dort die Position des Kultbildes ein. Seine Rücklehne ist unverziert und auf seiner Sitzfläche steht kein göttliches Attribut oder Symbol: Er ist ein sprechendes Beispiel für den Typus des wirklich „Leeren Throns“.[25] In unmittelbarer Nähe zur Tribune entdeckte Maurice Dunand einen marmornen Thron (**Abb. 10**).[26] Ein flaches Relief ziert die Rücklehne: Unter einem von Pflanzensäulen mit Hathor-Kapitellen getragenen Baldachin[27] steht ein Sphingenthron. Dieser ist aber nicht leer, sondern auf ihm hat eine frontal dem Beschauer zugewandte Frau in fließendem Gewand und mit langem Haar Platz genommen, die trotz des griechischen Habitus niemand andere sein kann als Astarte. Mit dem Kunstgriff des „Bildes im Bild“ umging der Bildhauer das sakrale Gebot der bildlosen Gestaltung dieses Möbels.[28] Von der Interpretation der von Veit Vaelske[29] erst eben entdeckten Inschriften an der Basis des Throns kann man sich neue Informationen zu dessen religiösem Kontext erhoffen.

Astrid Nunns These, anikonische, d.h. bildlose Votive nähmen im frühen Hellenismus tendenziell zu,[30] kann ich nur zustimmen. Entgegen Corinne Bonnet[31] sehe ich in diesem Phänomen eine rückwärtsgewandte, konservative Tendenz phönizischer Religiosität – eine Geisteshaltung, die versucht, dem Impetus der vehement eindringenden griechischen Bildwelt zu widerstehen.[32] Auch mit

[25] Stucky 1993: 21–23.74, Nr. 58, Taf. 15; zum sakralen Bereich der „Piscine du trône d’Astarté“: Stucky et al. 2005: 147–159, Abb. 85–96 Beilage 15.19; Bonnet 2015: 221.385–398, Abb. 48–49.

[26] Stucky 1993: 21–23.106–107, Abb. 9, Nr. 239, Taf. 56; die Fragmente des dritten Throns: 107–108, Nr. 240/241, Taf. 56; Nunn 2008: 181–183, No. 3–5, Pl. 2,4; 3,7; 5,11.

[27] Der obere Abschluss des Throns mit dem textilen Baldachin-Dach war einst in einem eigenen Marmorblock gearbeitet und anschließend an die Rückenlehne des Throns angestückt worden.

[28] Stucky 2012: 1190–1192.

[29] Vaelske/Stucky 2021.

[30] Nunn 2008: 178–179.

[31] Bonnet 2015: 396–397.

[32] Stucky 2001: 251–252; Stucky 2009, 11; Nunn 2008: 179.

der Feststellung, die phönizische Kunst religiösen Inhalts sei nicht grundsätzlich bilderfeindlich, hatte Astrid Nunn sicher recht.[33] Dennoch gibt es gewisse Ausnahmen von der Regel, zu denen neben dem „Leeren Thron" auch der hohe Weihrauchaltar zählt, von dem mehrere Exemplare unterschiedlichen Materials in Bostan esh-Sheikh gefunden wurden.[34] Offenbar setzte im fortgeschrittenen 4. Jahrhundert eine Tendenz ein, bisher als anikonisch konnotierte Monumente mit figürlichen Darstellungen zu schmücken: den Astarte-Thron mit dem Bild der sitzenden Göttin und den Weihrauchaltar mit jenem eines opfernden Priesters.[35] Wer oder was hat die Verbildlichung der ursprünglich bildlosen oder bildfreien Monumente angeregt? War es die im 4. Jahrhundert zunehmende Tendenz zur Bildlichkeit, die schlussendlich auch die Kategorie von ursprünglich bildlosen phönizischen Monumenten vereinnahmte?

Ein letzter, kurzer Blick gilt der Entwicklung Sidons im Hellenismus: Mit der Verschiebung der politischen, ökonomischen, kulturellen und religiösen Zentren weg von der Ostküste des Mittelmeers hin nach Ägypten und Syrien, nach Alexandria, Apamea und Antiochia am Orontes, verlieren die phönizischen Metropolen als wirtschaftliche, kulturelle und politische Drehscheiben zwischen Orient und Okzident nach und nach an Bedeutung. Bei unserer spezifischen Fragestellung lässt sich das Resultat dieses Vorgangs ganz direkt fassen: Kapitelle mit den vier sitzenden Löwengreifen,[36] die letzten „Temple-Boys",[37] der Alexandersarkophag mit seinen „Trabanten"[38] und die jüngsten anthropoiden Sarkophage[39] sind allesamt Schöpfungen der ersten Hälfte des 3. Jahrhunderts; danach wurde den Sidoniern der Import von Marmor offensichtlich zu kostspielig. Für den Bau der beiden hochhellenistischen Anlagen innerhalb des Eschmunheiligtums, der schon erwähnten „Piscine d'Astarté"[40] und des benachbarten Gebäudes mit den Kinderfriesen[41], verwendete man ausschließlich lokalen Kalkstein. Man muss schon das 2. und das 3. Jahrhundert u.Z. abwarten, bis in Gestalt reliefverzierter römischer Sarkophage Marmor wieder in großem Stil nach Sidon importiert wurde.

[33] Nunn 2008: 165–169.178–179; dazu Bonnet 2015, 389 mit Anm. 60; Nunn 2010: insbesondere 131–132.146–149.

[34] Stucky 1993: 75, Nr. 62–64, Abb. 5, Taf. 16; Stucky 2016.

[35] Stucky 2016: 460–462, Abb. 6 (der Weihrauchaltar stammt ebenfalls aus dem Eschmunheiligtum). Zur Deutung der „Stelen" oder „Pfeiler" als Weihrauchaltäre siehe auch: Spagnoli 2015.

[36] Stucky et al. 2005: 143–146, Abb. 84; 230–231, D1–D7.

[37] Siehe oben Abschnitt 3.1.

[38] von Graeve 1970.

[39] Frede 2000; Lembke 2001.

[40] Siehe oben Anm. 25.

[41] Stucky et al. 2005: 159–168, Abb. 97–99, Beilage 16–17.20–23.



Abb. 10: Sidon, Bostan esh-Sheikh. „Leerer Astarte-Thron“
(Beirut, National Museum. Zeichnung: François Larché).

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Bonnet, Corinne, 2013, Tribune d'Eshmoun ou Tribune d'Apollon. Lorsque Phéniciens et Grecs entrent dans la danse à Sidon: *Theologische Zeitschrift* 69, 193–206.

Bonnet, Corinne, 2015, *Les enfants de Cadmos. Le paysage religieux de la Phénicie hellénistique*, Paris.

Clermont-Ganneau, Charles, 1921, Le paradeisos royal achéménide de Sidon: *Revue Biblique* 30, 106–109.

Curtis, John/Shahrokh Razmjou, 2005, The Palace, in: John Curtis und Nigel Tallis (eds.), *Forgotten Empire. The World of Ancient Persia*, London, 50–103.

Decrouez, Danielle/Karl Ramseyer/Pierre-Alain Proz, 2010, Analyse de la pierre de quelques statues du Musée National de Beyrouth: *Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL* 14, 355–365.

Doumet-Serhal, Claude (ed.), 2004, *Decade. A Decade of Archaeology and History in the Lebanon*, Beirut.

Doumet-Serhal, Claude (ed.), 2013, *Sidon. 15 Years of Excavations. On the Occasion of the Exhibition „Sidon – The Best of 15 Years" 3 September – 3 November 2013, Sidon*, Beirut.

Elayi, Josette, 2005, *'Abd'Aštart I^er^/Straton de Sidon. Un roi phénicien entre Orient et Occident* (Transeuphratène Suppl. 12), Paris.

Ferron, Jean, 1993, *Sarcophages de Phénicie. Sarcophages à scènes en relief* (Collection cahiers de Byrsa. Série monographies Vol. 3), Paris.

Frede, Simone, 2000, *Die phönizischen anthropoiden Sarkophage,* Bd. 1*, Fundgruppen und Bestattungskontexte* (Forschungen zur phönizisch-punischen Plastik 1), Mainz.

Ganzmann, Lilo/Ella van der Meijden/Rolf A. Stucky, 1987, Das Eshmunheiligtum von Sidon. Die Funde der türkischen Ausgrabungen von 1901 bis 1903 im Archäologischen Museum in Istanbul: *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 37, 81–130.

von Graeve, Volkmar, 1970, *Der Alexandersarkophag und seine Werkstatt* (Istanbuler Forschungen 28), Berlin.

Knauss, Florian, 2006, Pasargadae, Susa, Persepolis. Die Paläste der Achämeniden, in: Alexander Koch (ed.), *Pracht und Prunk der Großkönige. Das Persische Weltreich*, Stuttgart, 101–111.

von Landau, Wilhelm, 1904, Vorläufige Nachrichten über die im Eshmuntempel bei Sidon gefundenen phönizischen Altertümer: *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft* 9, 1–69.

von Landau, Wilhelm, 1905, Ausgrabungen in Bostan-al sêh: *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft* 10, 1–16.

Lembke, Katja, 2001, *Phönizische anthropoide Sarkophage* (Damaszener Forschungen 10), Mainz.

Macridy, Théodore C., 1902, Le temple d'Echmoun à Sidon: *Revue Biblique* 11, 489–515.

Macridy, Théodore C., 1903, Le temple d'Echmoun à Sidon: *Revue Biblique* 12, 69–77.

Mathys, Hans-Peter, 2005, Die phönizischen Inschriften, in: Stucky et al. 2005, 273–318.

Nunn, Astrid, 2008, Iconisme et aniconisme dans le culte des religions phénicienne et israélite: *Transeuphratène* 35, 165–196.

Nunn, Astrid, 2010, Bildhaftigkeit und Bildlosigkeit im Alten Orient: ein Widerspruch?, in: Dahlia Shehata, Frauke Weiershäuser und Kamran V. Zand (eds.), *Von Göttern und Menschen. Beiträge zur Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Orients. Festschrift für Brigitte Groneberg* (Cuneiform Monographs 41), Leiden/Boston, 131–167.

Pasquier, Alain, 1977, Pan et les Nymphes de l'antre corycien, in: *Études Delphiques* (Bulletin de Corréspondance Hellénique, Suppl. 4), Athen/Paris, 365–387.

Salamé-Sarkis, Hassan, 1987, Un problème *d'interpretatio phoenissa* (?): la pseudo tribune d'Eshmoun à Sidon: *Berytus* 35, 120–125.

Schmidt, Erich Friedrich, 1953, *Persepolis* Vol. 1: *Structures, reliefs, inscriptions* (Oriental Institute Publications 68), Chicago.

Spagnoli, Federica, 2015, In the Nostrils of God. Stone Incense Altars in the Phoenician Cult Context, in: Claude Doumet-Serhal und Anne-Marie Maïla-Afeiche (eds.), *Cult and Ritual on the Levantine Coast and its Impact on the Eastern Mediterranean Realm. Proceedings of the International Symposium, Beirut 2012* (Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL Hors-Série 10), Beirut, 215–234.

Stucky, Rolf A., 1984, *Tribune d'Echmoun. Ein griechischer Reliefzyklus des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. in Sidon* (Antike Kunst, Beiheft 13), Basel.

Stucky, Rolf A., 1993, *Die Skulpturen aus dem Eschmun-Heiligtum bei Sidon* (Antike Kunst, Beiheft 17), Basel.

Stucky, Rolf A., 2001, Acculturation et retour aux sources: Sidon aux époques perse et hellénistique, in: Regula Frei-Stolba und Kristine Gex (eds.), *Recherches récentes dur le monde hellénistique. Actes du colloque international organisé à l'occasion du 60e anniversaire de Pierre Ducrey (Lausanne, 20–21 novembre 1998)*, Bern, 247–258.

Stucky, Rolf A., 2004, Éléments de construction en marbre à décor animalier de Sidon et la culture phénicienne aux époques perse et hellénistique ancienne, in: Doumet-Serhal 2004, 214–223.

Stucky, Rolf A., 2009, Griechischer Marmor in der Levante. Zur Zeitstellung phönizischer Baureliefs und Architekturelemente aus Marmor, in: Ralph Einicke et al. (eds.), *Zurück zum Gegenstand. Festschrift für Andreas E. Furtwängler* (Schriften des Zentrums für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des Schwarzmeerraums 16), Langenweissbach, Bd. 1, 7–13.

Stucky, Rolf A., 2012, Du marbre grec en Phénicie. Grandeur et décadance de Sidon aux époques perse et hellénistique: *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1177–1203.

Stucky, Rolf A., 2016, „Du sollst Dir (k)ein Bildnis machen." Phönizische Weihrauchaltäre mit Schrift und Bild, in: Hanna Jenni und Markus Saur (eds.), *Nächstenliebe und Gottesfurcht. Beiträge aus alttestamentlicher, semitischer und altorientalischer Wissenschaft für Hans-Peter Mathys zum 65. Geburtstag* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 439), Münster, 453–469.

Stucky, Rolf A., 2017, Le „prince jardinier": l'avènement d'Abdalonymos de Sidon. Valeurs cosmiques de la royauté orientale, méconnue par les Grecs, in: Hédi Dridi, Danielle Wieland-Leibundgut und Jeannette Kraese (eds.), *Phéniciens et Puniques en Méditerrannée. L'apport de la recherche suisse* (Philainos 2), Rom, 15–26.

Stucky, Rolf A. et al., 2005, *Das Eschmun-Heiligtum von Sidon. Architektur und Inschriften* (Antike Kunst, Beiheft 19), Basel.

Stucky, Rolf A. et al., 2016, Sculptures et éléments d'architecture de Sidon en marbre: *Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL* 16, 311–328.

Vaelske, Veit/Rolf A. Stucky, 2021, Newly Found Greek Graffiti from the Eshmun Sanctuary Near Saïda: *Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL* 21, 383–388.

Walker, Susan/Michael Hughes, 2010, Parian Marble in the Dynastic Monuments of Lycia and Caria, in: Demetrius U. Schilardi und Dora Katsonopoulou (eds.), *Paria Lithos. Parian Quarries, Marble and Workshops of Sculpture. Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades, Paros, 2–5 Octobre 1997*, 2. Auflage, Athen, 445–451.

Will, Ernest, 1985, Un problème d'interpretatio graeca: la pseudo tribune d'Eshmoun à Sidon: *Syria* 62, 105–124.

THE *MARZEAḤ* INSCRIPTION FROM BOSTAN ESH-SHEIKH (*PH30*)*

Hans-Peter Mathys and Rolf A. Stucky

During his excavations in Bostan esh-Sheikh, an extraurban sanctuary situated near Sidon and dedicated to Eshmun,[1] *Maurice Dunand, the excavator of the site, discovered a series of important Phoenician and Greek inscriptions as well as an Egyptian one. These inscriptions disappeared during the early 1980s. Many of them, but not all, were documented by photographs, which allowed them to be published or republished in 2005,*[2] *Dunand having already worked on some of them himself.*[3] *The hope of recovering the originals and so being able to eliminate possible mistakes in the 2005 publication had been given up when, thanks to the initiative of Jean-Baptiste Yon, some inscriptions were rediscovered in the 'donjon' of the crusaders' castle of Byblos.*[4] *Among these inscriptions there were also four dedicatory inscriptions in Phoenician which were not well documented in the papers of the late Maurice Dunand. The most important among them,* Ph30*, will be analysed in the present paper.*[5]

* We wish to thank Jean-Baptiste Yon for providing the image for **Fig. 1** as well as Sarkis el-Khoury, Director General of the Lebanon Antiquities Authority, and Anne Marie Afeiche, Conservator of the National Museum of Beirut, for the permission to publish it. The plan of the two Hestiatoria (**Fig. 3**) was drawn by Cyril Voronine, and that of the 'Bâtiment aux frises d'enfants' (**Fig. 4**) by Dr Bernhard Kolb. The modification of the latter and the preparation of the overall plan (**Fig. 5**) was completed by Samuel Sarasin, whom we also wish to thank for the line drawing of the inscription (**Fig. 2**). Stephen Germany proofread the English text of the article. Our deep thanks go to all of them.

[1] Cf. the contribution of Rolf Stucky in the present volume, 1–18.

[2] Mathys 2005. The inscriptions found during the excavations by Th. C. Macridy Bey at the beginning of the twentieth century (see von Landau 1904) are also included in this volume.

[3] Dunand 1965; Dunand 1970. Further publications on the corpus of inscriptions from Bostan esh-Sheikh (excluding the building inscriptions of Bodashtart): Lagrange 1902a; Lagrange 1902b; von Landau 1904; Röllig 1969–70; Mullen 1974; Teixidor 1986: 11.210f.371f.; Stucky 1993; Stucky and Mathys 2000; Mathys 2005.

[4] Yon and Apicella 2005.

[5] The four newly discovered Phoenician inscriptions (*Ph27–30*) are published in: Mathys and Stucky 2018. *Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises* (forthcoming). – The numbering of the Phoenician inscriptions in this article as well as in the present publication follows the numbering of the inscriptions published in Mathys 2005; the numbering of the Greek inscriptions follows Wachter 2005.

1. The archaeological evidence

The catalog card of Maurice Dunand reads as follows:

> "E 2021 (23 mai 1973)
> 13/10
> haut. 0.16 m ; larg. 0.145 m ; ép. 0.055 m
>
> Fragment d'une petite stèle (? [*sic*]) de marbre blanc probablement incomplète. Il manque un large éclat dans un angle. Inscription phénicienne de 8 lignes en petits caractères. Un frotté est collé au revers mais rend mal. Revers martelé, fruste." (**Fig. 1** and **2**).

The archaeological evidence is fairly clear: The inscription was discovered on May 23, 1973 in the grid square 13/10; an indication of the level is missing. The grid squares cover three distinct loci: first, the surface of the northeastern corner of the Bodashtart podium, secondly, the area of the channel that runs along the north side of the podium and, third, the area at the foot of the podium between the 'Bâtiment aux frises d'enfants' and the 'Tribune d'Echmoun' (**Fig. 5**). Thanks to the date of the find, the unclear find-site can be decided in favor of the third variant: In May 1973, the excavator opened the locus at the foot of the podium; the inscription thus belongs to an archaeological context which can no longer be specified with precision, situated between the two large pools I and I / VI.

The back of the inscription is roughly carved, indicating that it was embedded in a wall of one of the monuments near the building which served as meeting rooms for the guilds that celebrated a *marzeaḥ*, which is mentioned in the inscription (see p. 22).

2. Transcription and translation[6]

1) [ʔ]yt[7] mš[8] [..
   Votive offering ...

[6] Alternative readings of letters and translations are separated from each other by slashes.

[7] *ʔyt* / *ʔt* / *t* in Phoenician and Punic normally serves to mark the accusative. In a Punic inscription, Antas VII,1, it precedes the nominative: [*ʔ*]*t mš z ʔš ndr*: "(it is) this statue (as a vow offering) which vowed" (Fantar, in Acquaro 1969: 78). According to Friedrich, Röllig, and Amadasi Guzzo 1999: §275, p. 196f. it originally served to highlight the following word, whether the subject or the object.

[8] The term *m*[*ʔ*]*š*$_1$, attested exclusively in Phoenician and Punic, denotes a votive offering or the statue constituting this offering; see Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995: 589f.





Fig. 1–2: Photo and line drawing of the inscription *Ph30*.

2) [p/n]t sp[9]/n d/rb (?) [...]
   Bowl / chief (big)
3) bʕl ysp [...
   Baal may add / has added / Baalyasop
4) ʔšmn ṭ/y/ʕ/ḥmr/d/n[...
   Eshmun has hidden / new wine[10] / may (verb expressing a desire)
5) bdl[11] lmrzḥ[12]
   Reserved (set aside)[13] for the *marzeaḥ* / tin[14] (vessel) for the *marzeaḥ*
6) ʕštrt tʕzrn
   Astarte may help me / us[15]
7) ʕštrt hʔdrt
   Astarte, the magnificent
8) šm(?)[16]š ybrkn
   Shamash may bless me / us

[9] The noun *sp* ist attested in Akkadian (*sappu*[*n*] I: von Soden 1972: 1027), Ugaritic (Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartin 2004a: 765), Hebrew (*sap* I: Dietrich and Arnet 2013: 380), and in Phoenician and Punic (*sp*: Krahmalkov 2000: 347). The term primarily refers to a cultic object.

[10] For attestations of this noun in Phoenician see Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995: 383f.; Krahmalkov 2000: 188.

[11] Probably the passive participle 'badil'; for the vocalization see Friedrich, Röllig, and Amadasi Guzzo 1999: § 139, p. 85f.

[12] Due to the poor preservation of the inscription, it cannot be determined whether there were more letters (a word) on this line or not.

[13] The root *bdl* (set aside, separate) is attested in Hebrew, Qumranic Hebrew, Middle Hebrew, and Jewish Aramaic (cf. Dietrich and Arnet 2013: 57). In Arabic it means 'to replace' (cf. Wehr 1985: 71). In Ugaritic, it means 'to substitute, reserve personnel' or the like (Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartin 2004: 214).

[14] The etymology of this term is uncertain; is it a loanword? (cf. Dietrich and Arnet 2013: 57); it occurs in lists of metals.

[15] Cf. Friedrich, Röllig, and Amadasi Guzzo 1999: § 187–190, pp. 123–130 ['Verba mit Objektsuffixen']. According to them there is only one attestation of this verbal suffix, CIS I 418 (votive inscription from Carthage): *lrbt ltnt pn bʕl wlʔdn bʕl ḥmn ʔš ndr špṭ bn ʕbdmlqrt bn bdʕtrt tbrkn wšmʕ qln*: "To the lady, to Taanit, Panbaal, and to the Lord Baal Hamon, what has vowed ŠPṬ, son of ʕBDMLQRT, son of BDʕTRT: may he bless us, because he has heard our voice." See the editors' comment (441): "Lineis 6–7, formam habes in titulis Taniteis insolitem, pronomen 1ae personae suffixum (ut qln [tr.] probat); apparet inde votum a viro vovente pro se et suis factum esse; ordo et ipse vocabularium inversus." Cf. Kition III A 30,3 (*ybrkn*): "may he bless us/me" (Guzzo Amadasi and Karageorghis 1977: 45). The decision in favor of the singular or plural translation of the suffix must rely on the surrounding context.

[16] At most, one can still recognize traces of the right long smear of the letter. It almost seems as if the letter is damaged. No other reconstruction makes better sense, and the present reconstruction suggests itself for another reason: Shamash plays a major role in the pantheon of Bostan esh-Sheikh.

3. PALAEOGRAPHY

The inscription, in which the individual words are separated from each other, is probably written in ragged-left alignment, making a reconstruction of the missing parts a pure guess with many unknowns. To make matters worse, the writer is not a very skilled one, as even non-experts can easily discover. The form of the individual letters is not the same in every case. Therefore, palaeography should not be given too much importance, and the inscription should not be used too quickly and uncritically for reconstructing the history of the Phoenician script. The inscription has no peculiarities that allow it to be dated to the 3rd or even 2nd century. Generally speaking, the inscription can be dated to the 5th to the 4th century BCE on palaeographic grounds.

Even a quick glance at the inscription makes clear that the letters on the first lines are rather small and close to one another, whereas in the second part of the inscription they are clearly separated from each other and are generally larger than on the first line; but even here, their size varies. In addition, the angle of inclination of the individual letters fluctuates considerably; this is especially clear for *beth* (to the right on l. 5, to the left on l. 8).

- In comparison to earlier forms (cf. e.g. Tabnit), *aleph* (ll. [l], 4, 7) tilts considerably in a counter-clockwise direction, as is also the case for the fragments from the Eshmun temple and the *šlmn* inscription.[17]
- The form of *ḥet* on l. 5 resembles that attested on other inscriptions from Bostan esh-Sheikh and on the *šlmn* inscription.[18]
- *yod* (ll. 1.3.8) is attested in three slightly different forms. The letter forms a semicircle (ll. 3.8), which is open to the lower side and divided in two parts by a vertical centre stroke. In l. 8, this stroke does not lead from the centre of the circle to the circle line, but beyond it, which is not the case in ll. 1 and 3. This could be a simplification or a variation of a common form of this letter, which has a 'tail' at its top right. In l. 1, there is no semicircle, but two oblique strokes of an isosceles triangle.[19] The form in l. 3 is also attested on *Ph1*.[20]
- The variation in size is especially marked for *lamed*. Whereas the shaft of the two examples on l. 5 is quite long, it is extremely short on l. 3. By contrast, the foot and dropline are approximately the same for the

[17] See Peckham 1968: 67 (nos. 7–9).

[18] First publication: Renan 1891: 75–77; Lidzbarski 1898: 418; Teixidor 1986: 441f.; see the illustrations on p. 440; Gubel 2002: 86f.

[19] Cf. Peckham 1968: 67.69 for the forms of the letters in Sidon (and Tyre) from the 5th to the 2nd century BCE.

[20] See Mathys 2005: Pl. Ph1. The first *yod* in this inscription has a tail, whereas the second one corresponds exactly to the *yod* in Ph30, l.

three *lamed*. Probably the shaft of the *lamed* in l. 3 is so short because the space between l. 2 and l. 3 is rather narrow. And since the *samek* in l. 2 tilts to the left, its shaft forms nearly a horizontal line, which made it impossible to extend the shaft of the two *lamed*s on l. 3 further upwards. This is different for the shafts of the two *lamed*s on l. 5, which 'vertically intersect' with the letters of l. 4. If one does not take this fact into account, one could be tempted to read *nun* in l. 3 instead of *lamed* and translate 'in the eye of'.

- As for *mem*, the photograph does not allow for any well-founded conclusions.
- The *shin* resembles to some extent the one attested in other inscriptions from Bostan esh-Sheikh.[21] It is rounded, and the right stroke goes below the baseline. There are no major differences between the attestations of *shin* in *Ph30*.
- The attestations of *taw* differ greatly in size. This becomes particularly clear when comparing the final *taw* of Ashtarte in l. 6, which is tall, with the first letter in the following word, also a *taw*, which is smaller. This difference is not due to the fact that *taw* is the final letter in the name of the goddess; otherwise the first *taw* in this word should be smaller. The *taw*s differ not only in size, but also considerably in their form. However, this difference could also be due to their different size.
- The most interesting letter is *he* (l. 7). Its shape makes perfectly clear that the scribe is not an accomplished expert in writing. It is a cursive character which can be used when writing with ink on papyrus or ostraca. To my knowledge, this form is not attested on other inscriptions, whereas other cursive forms of the letter are known.[22] These simplify the shape of the letter even more than is the case for *Ph30*; they are found on the Saqqarah papyrus (probably second half of the 6th century BCE),[23] on the Elephantine ostraca (5th century BCE),[24] the temple tariff of Kition (4th–3rd century BCE),[25] and the Cairo papyrus.[26] The scribe of *Ph30* most probably had a sketch at his disposition which

[21] Mathys 2005: passim; see also Peckham 1968: 66, especially No. 8.

[22] See Friedrich, Röllig, and Amadasi Guzzo 1999: Schrifttafel V. Neupunisch und Kursiv-Phönizisch. The *he* on the ostraca from the temple of Eshmun can be be considered to be a further simplification of the one studied here. The scribe of the temple tariff of Kition retained the monumental form of *he*. See the respective charts in Peckham 1965; Vanel 1967.

[23] Aimé-Giron 1940: Pl. XL.

[24] Lidzbarski 1912.

[25] CIS I 86; KAI 37; Gibson 1982 (1998) No. 33.

[26] Aimé-Giron 1938: 1–18.

he strictly followed, even though the formal *he* would have been much easier to execute than the cursive one on marble.[27]

4. COMMENTARY

L. 1: The reconstruction of the broken left side is hardly possible. It cannot be separated from the material reconstruction of the remaining elements on the first three lines and above all the interpretation of this part of the inscription.

Ph30 is identified as a votive inscription by the second word of l. 1, *m*(*ʾ*)*š*,[28] which means 'votive offering'. Although votive inscriptions can vary widely, they usually have the following fixed elements:[29]

- designation of the votive offering (followed by the relative pronoun); this information can be omitted if the inscription stands on the votive offering
- verb ('has given / offered' or the like)
- name of the donor
- deity to which the offering is made
- blessings / requests.

Because of the partially poor state of preservation of the inscription, only the first and the last element can be identified with certainty. The reconstruction of the inscription also proves to be difficult, since it clearly differs formally from other votive inscriptions.

L. 2 is the most problematic part of the inscription. The space between the words is quite large. The word following *sp* most probably has a *resh* as its first letter. The most probable candidate for the following letter is *bet*, which is palaeographically possible. One can thus reconstruct *rb*, 'chief', 'big', or the like. *rb* might be the title of the man who presided over the *marzeaḥ* and who made the votive offering.

The two preceding letters can be read as *sp* and translated with 'bowl' or the like. It might be the item offered to the deity. As for the first two letters of the line, we have not yet found any convincing interpretation.

L. 3: There are no palaeographical problems, and the line can be translated either as "Baal added" or "Baal will / may add".[30] However, it is also possible

[27] As a side remark: The monumental form of *he* has proved to be very persistent. This can be seen in the Hebrew inscriptions (especially ostraca), where there are only a few examples of the letter with cursive forms (cf. the palaeographic charts in Renz and Röllig 1995).

[28] The term is attested in Phoenician and Punic; see Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995: 589f.: "prob. meaning, votive donation, statue as votive donation" (590).

[29] For further details see Al-Ghul 1991.

[30] For the forms attested see Friedrich, Röllig, and Amadasi Guzzo 1999: § 158, p. 100.

to read the donor's name here: Baalyasop, meaning "Baal may add (further)", i.e. offspring. This name is well attested in Phoenician and especially in Punic.[31] One can argue against this interpretation that there is a fair amount of space between *bʕl* and *ysp*. A proper name would be more likely written as one word, in *scriptio continua*. If the third line actually contains a proper name, this would mean that the first three lines of the inscription probably contain all of the necessary elements of a votive inscription with the exception of the last one (the requests being contained in ll. 5–8), i.e.: the votive offering, the relative pronoun *ʔš*, a verb, and the name of the donor. Another reason to give preference to the first option is the fact that lines 4.6.7.8 also begin with the name of a deity.

L. 4 begins with the name of the god Eshmun, the male head deity of Bostan esh-Sheikh. Reconstructing the letters following the name of the god Eshmun is to some extent guesswork, since only one of the following three letters can be identified with a relatively high degree of certainty, i.e. the second one, a *mem*. A *shin* cannot be ruled out completely, although unlike the other attestations of this letter, here it does not have rounded forms. As for the first letter, the most likely reconstruction is *ṭet*, but *ʿayin* and *yod* can also be considered. The last letter is either a *resh*, *dalet*, or *nun*. The inclination of its shaft is an argument in favor of *nun*. The most probable reconstruction of the three letters would be *ṭmn*, 'hide', a root well attested in Hebrew.[32] However, another possibility can be considered. The first letter of the second word is barely legible. Perhaps the writer made a mistake and tried to correct it. This possibility is even more probable, since a comparable case occurs in l. 8, where a *mem* must be inserted between the two *shin*. If this thesis is correct, one can also read *ḥet* as the first letter of the word, which could then be read as *ḥmr*, '(new) wine'. Ll. 3 and 4 could then be reconstructed as follows: "Baal may add ..., Eshmun new wine."

L. 5: We reach more solid ground in this line. As shown, it allows two translations, the first one being: 'reserved/assigned (literally: separated) for the *marzeaḥ*'. If this interpretation is correct, the item/object reserved for the *marzeaḥ* must be mentioned on the preceding line, which is possible. However, if the second option is the correct one, then l. 5 would refer to an object made of tin used in the context of a *marzeaḥ*, such as a bowl.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to say whether another word followed after *lmrzḥ*. Judging from the the space that remains, this is possible; traces of a letter might be discernible. Since the *marzeaḥ* is often associated with a specific deity, *lmrzḥ* might be followed by the name of a deity. If this is the case, the traces of this putative letter must correspond to *b* (Baal), *aleph* (Eshmun), *ʿayin* (Astarte)

[31] Avigad 1964: 194; CIS 1307.2; 4527.4; 4873.4; 4949.4/5; cf. Benz 1972: 94. Cf. the biblical name 'Joseph'.

[32] Cf. Dietrich and Arnet 2013: 198; it is a dissimilated form of *ṭmr*; cf. *temēru* in Akkadian (von Soden 1981: 1345f.), *ṭmr* in Syriac (Payne Smith 1998: 176f.), *ṭfr* in ethiopic (Leslau 1991: 588).

or *shin* (Shamash). They do not correspond to *aleph*, which consists entirely of straight strokes, or to *ʿayin*, which forms a perfect circle. In contrast, these traces are compatible with *bet* or *shin*. Since Shamash played an important role in Bostan esh-Sheikh, he is the most likely candidate. However, this reconstruction is not mandatory. The writer may have jumped to a new line after *lmrzḥ*.

L. 6–8. The last three lines, the reading of which does not cause any difficulties and which will now be discussed, have an almost poetic flavor. They contain requests, as may ll. 3 and 5 as well. Most often in votive offerings there is only one request.[33]

(Eshmun may …)
(Baal may continue)
Ashtarte may help me / us
Astarte, the magnificent,
Shamash may bless me / us.

In l. 6, the verb *ʕzr* 'to help'[34] comes as a surprise[35] in the present context, as it occurs very rarely in Phoenician and Punic,[36] the best known exemple being a Punic inscription:[37]

lʔdn lbʕlḥmn wltnt pʕn bʕl ʔš ndr mgn bn ḥnʔ kšmʕ qlʔ brkʔ ʕzrʔ ytn lʔ nʕm

To the Lord, to BʕL PʕNBʕL, which MGN, son of ḤNʔ, has vowed, because he has heard his voice; he blessed him, he helped him, and he did him good.

Blessing and help are two entirely different categories.[38] If someone implores the help of the deity, this normally means that that person is in trouble. Blessing refers to the constant, consistent action of the deity (giving offspring, rain, food), while help involves the deity's occasional intervention. However, it is also possible that the symposiasts, by imploring the gods' help, ask them to support their activities, to promote the association, and to stand by its side.

[33] E.g. Ph1 (Mathys 2005: 275).

[34] With the exceptions of Akkadian and Ethiopic, the root is attested in all branches of the Semitic languages; cf. Bergmann 1976: 256.

[35] Chabot casually makes an interesting comment: "[f]ormule finale intéressante" (Chabot 1917: 65).

[36] The other attestations of this root in Phoenician and Punic are found either in damaged contexts or are not clear; for more details see Krahmalkov 2000: 363f.; Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995: 836f.

[37] Text: Chabot 1917: 65. For other possible attestations of the root, see Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995: 836.

[38] Cf. Westermann 1978: especially 28f.; 88–90.

5. THE DEITIES IN THE *MARZEAḤ* INSCRIPTION

Ph30 does not provide any information as to the recipient of the votive offering. Most probably, it is one of the deities mentioned in ll. 4–8, i.e. Baal, Eshmun, Astarte, and Shamash.[39] The most unlikely candidate is Baal, who is not mentioned in the other inscriptions from Bostan esh-Sheikh (if we exclude the attestations contained in proper names). The main deities listed in the *marzeaḥ* inscription – Eshmun, Astarte, and Shamash – also appear on the magical squares from Bostan esh-Sheikh.[40] The centrality of Eshmun and Astarte was known even before the publication of these squares, while Shamash only came to prominence thanks to them. The *marzeaḥ* inscription contains another hint at his central position in Bostan esh-Sheikh. Can we infer from this that in Bostan esh-Sheikh a triad of deities predominated, namely Eshmun, Astarte, and Shamash?

Astarte has a special significance in this triad insofar as she is attested twice in the inscription; moreover, she is the only deity honored by an epithet, i.e. 'the magnificent one'. This epithet is quite common in the Phoenician-Punic realm. In an inscription found at Memphis and dating to the second to the 1st century BCE we read: *lʔlm ʔdrt ʔs*, "to the great goddess Isis".[41] The same epithet is given to the god ʔSKN on an inscription dating to the 3rd century BCE.[42] In Antas, the god Ṣid is called *(h)ʔdr* quite frequently.[43] In Hofra, *ʔdr*(*t*) is used with reference to Baal and Tannit.[44] And finally, it appears in some inscriptions refering to Astarte; but the previously known evidence was all of African provenance.[45]

It should also be noted that Yahweh, the God of Israel, is given this epithet as well.[46] This once again makes clear that Israel was part of a Levantine *koine*.

Prior to the discovery of *Ph30*, Baal was not attested as a god in the inscriptions of Bostan esh-Sheikh except in proper names.[47] If our interpretation

[39] On the deities in Sidon see Lipiński 1995: 123–192; on Astarte see Bonnet 1996; on Eshmun see Lipiński 1992: 158–160; Xella 1993; on Shamash see Kutter 2008: 211–294.

[40] See Mathys 2005: 295–318; Mathys 2008.

[41] KAI 48,2.

[42] KAI 58.

[43] Fantar, in Acquaro 1969: inscription I,1, p. 51; inscription VII,1, p. 78; inscription IX, p. 80; inscription X, p. 81; inscription XI, p. 82; inscription XVIII,1, p. 87; Uberti 1980: 196f.

[44] Berthier and Charlier 1955: 132,1f., p. 101 (for other attestations see the alphabetical index, 237); KAI 72,B.3.

[45] CIS I 255,4; 4842,6f.; 4843,4.

[46] Ps 8,1.10; 76,5; 93,4; cf. Ahlström 1973: 80; the root *ʔdr* is also otherwise associated with God in the Old Testament.

[47] However, it appears in the proper name BʕLŠLM in Bostan esh-Sheikh (*Ph2*) (see Mathys 2005: 277) and in theophorous names attested in the ostraca found in Bostan esh-Sheikh (see Vanel 1969: 361), the best attested being BʕLŠLM.

of l. 5 is correct, it might contain the first mention of this god. At first glance, Baal does not seem to play an important role in Sidon. While there are many Tyrian kings whose names contain the theophoric element Baal, in Sidon this is the case only for Baalshillem I/II. However, his importance should not be underestimated, as is clear from the inscription on the sarcophagus of Eshmunazor II. In this inscription, Eshmunazor enumerates the temples he has built for the gods:[48]

> the houses of the gods – the [house of Astar]te[49] in Sidon-Land-by-the-Sea, and we (also) established Astarte (in) Lofty-Heavens; and we (it were) who built in the Mountain a house for Eshmun, the prince of the sanctuary of the Ydll-Spring, and we (also) established him (in) Lofty-Heavens; and we (it were) who built houses for the gods of the Sidonians in Sidon-Land-by-the-Sea, a house for Baal of Sidon and a house for Astarte-Name-of-Baal.

If the order of the deities (or of the sanctuaries built for them) mentioned in this part of the inscription allows for conclusions regarding their relative importance, there is no doubting the preeminent position of Astarte and Eshmun in the inscriptions from Bostan esh-Sheikh. In *Ph30*, the primacy of Eshmun and Astarte is expressed in a different way, i.e. by the fact that they take two lines (ll. 4f., 6f. respectively), whereas Baal and Shamash have to make do with a single one (ll. 3, 8 respectively). Perhaps Baal appears first in *Ph30* because he is considered the city god of Sidon.

Of course, these considerations are only hypotheses. Moreover, they can only be valid on the premise that our palaeographic reconstruction and interpretation of the inscription, especially of l. 3, are correct.

6. THE *MARZEAḤ*[50]

Marzeaḥ is the term used to describe a (private) association of mostly well-to-do men[51] as well as their meetings. According to most (but not all) researchers, the *marzeaḥ* was a funerary banquet.[52] The *marzeaḥ* may be attested in Ebla, and it certainly is in Emar, Ugarit, Palmyra, Phoenicia, Moab, Israel, Elephantine, among the Nabateans, in the Talmudic literature, and on the map of Madeba. The *marzeaḥ* is also attested over a very long period of time.

[48] Ll. 15–18; translation: Gibson 1982 (1998): 109.

[49] The last letter of Astarte, *taw*, being clearly visible, this reconstruction cannot be contradicted.

[50] For a detailed treatment of the *marzeaḥ* see McLaughlin 2001; for a short overview see Niehr 1998: 135f.

[51] But not exclusively: Guilds of soldiers, workers, writers, and even slaves are attested in Petra; see Healey 2001: 166; Knauf 2003.

[52] This majority view is heavily contested by McLaughlin 2001: 70–79.

Certainly a *marzeaḥ* held in Ugarit in the fourteenth century BCE was quite different from a *marzeaḥ* celebrated during the Achaemenid period in a Phoenician city. Yet there are also constants independent of time and space that allow for a reconstruction of an 'ideal' *marzeaḥ*. The most important elements are the following:

1. Some written sources indicate that the *marzeaḥ* associations owned a building called *bt mrzḥ*; this is in accordance with archaeological findings (on the situation in Bostan esh-Sheikh, see below).
2. The *marzeaḥ* was organized hierarchically. In some sources the ruler is called *rb*, whereas the members of the associations are called *ḥbr*.
3. Professional corporations occupy an important place among the *marzeaḥ*. They probably also had the task of representing the professional and economic interests of their members.
4. The *marzeaḥ* was financed by contributions of the members. However, donations are also attested. In addition to houses and meeting rooms, certain *marzeaḥ* associations also owned land and vineyards.
5. The religious aspect inherent to the *marzeaḥ*, though quite important, is difficult to assess.
6. Little is known about how the meetings of a *marzeaḥ* were run. The consumption of alcohol was a central element of the institution. Part of the meeting was devoted to the cult of the dead, i.e. a funerary gathering. Perhaps political and philosophical discussions and the exchange of views on other topics played an important role in these meetings as well.

Prior to the discovery of *Ph30*, there was no inscription found through supervised excavations in the Phoenician heartlands mentioning a *marzeaḥ*. So far, there have been only three attestations of the noun in Phoenician / Punic:

1. A flat bowl made of bronze acquired through the antiquities market and dating to the 4th/3rd century BCE. Its provenance is unclear; it was found either in a Phoenician city or in Cyprus. The latter is given slight preference by Guzzo Amadasi.[53] The inscription on the bowl reads as follows:[54]

   qbʕm ʔnḥn II ʕrbt lmrzḥ šmš
   Cups we 2 offer for the *mrzḥ* of Shamash.

   The translation and even the word order of this short inscription are highly controversial, but this does not matter in the present context.

[53] Guzzo Amadasi 1987: 124f.

[54] First publication: Avigad and Greenfield 1982. For a comparison see the translation of Krahmalkov 2000: 423: "<This is> the drinking cup that I, Hanno, presented to the *marzeḥ*- sodality of Semes"; another important contribution: Guzzo Amadasi 1987.

2. The so-called 'tariff of Marseille', which can also be dated to the 4th or 3rd century BCE.[55] The inscription was found in the immediate vicinity of the city; perhaps it is originally from Carthage. It lists the various tariffs the priests of the Temple of Baal-Ṣaphon ask for the services they provide. These religious services are also called *mrzḥ ʔlm* (l. 16), *marzeaḥ* in honor of the deity.
3. Finally, a Phoenician inscription from Piraeus, to be dated to 96 BCE.[56] The local community of the Sidonians has decided to crown with a golden crown a certain Šembaal and to build a chiseled stele in memory of this event. The first line of the inscription reads as follows:[57]

> On the fourth day of the feast [*mrzḥ*], in the 14th year of the people of Sidon.

Since we cannot present and discuss all the materials referring to the *marzeaḥ* here, we limit ourselves to Roman-period Palmyra, where the *marzeaḥ* is best documented.[58] There are three types of sources: tesserae (a), inscriptions (b), and archaeological remains of the meeting rooms (c).

a. Only some of the information derived from the tesserae can be mentioned here. Some of them served as entrance 'tickets'.[59] – Some tesserae name men who perform the function of a superior, *rb mrzḥ*;[60] there is even an abstract noun derived from this function name, *brbnwt mrzḥ*, 'during / under the presidency for the *marzeaḥ* of'.[61] – The inscription on the reverse side of RTP 211[62] (= PAT 2210),[63] *gny* / *mn*y, 'berth / portion',[64] is probably an indication that the symposiasts were lying on berths during the meetings and received a certain portion (of food, wine?) for the banquet. – On many of the tesserae, not all of them belonging to the *marzeaḥ*, there are illustrations representing kraters, ladles, wine pitchers, offerings, priests measuring portions, and so on; some of them refer to the *marzeaḥ* banquets.[65]

[55] KAI 69(,16).
[56] KAI 60(,1). See also Gibson 1982 (1998): 148–151.
[57] Translation by Gibson 1982 (1998): 149.
[58] For a concise description see McLaughlin 2001: 48–61.
[59] Ingholt, Seyrig, Starcky, and Caquot 1955: iv. For an overview of other interpretations see Seyrig 1940: 53f.
[60] RTP 27.30–33.35 (= PAT 2033.2036–2039.2041); Ingholt, Seyrig, Starcky, and Caquot 1955: 5–7; Hillers and Cussini 1996: 283.
[61] PAT 0265,4; 0316,1; 1358,1; 2743,2; 2812,1; Hillers and Cussini 1996: 64.74.200.318.328.
[62] Ingholt, Seyrig, Starcky, and Caquot 1955: 30.
[63] Hillers and Cussini 1996: 289.
[64] On the philological interpretation of the two terms see Ingholt, Seyrig, Starcky, and Caquot 1955: 143.
[65] See the catalogue and the plates in Ingholt, Seyrig, Starcky, and Caquot 1955.

b. Eight inscriptions of different length form an enlightening source for the reconstruction of the *marzeaḥ* in Palmyra. The longest and the most informative among them, PAT 0991, characterized as 'statut de thiase' by Teixidor,[66] reads as follows:[67]

> (1) In the month of Adar, in the year 300 […] (2) the priests of Belastor and Baʿl[shamen …] (3) those among them the days when there will be a ban[quet … the member of] (4) the *marzēaḥ* who will be at their head for the sacri[fice …] (5) but the member who will be elected at their [head …] (6) 3 Tyrian s(hekels) to the treasurer and the one from among them […] (7) in the banquet hall the agreement will be inscribed on […] (8) and the one who will collect their votes will notify […] (9) who will be elected over the treasury and will be in charg[e…] (10) of the one who will be in charge during his year and also they have decided [that] a person will [no]t have the power …] (11) an oath in the banquet hall and anyone who swore (an oath but) did not keep it will pay a fine in de[narii … and also] (12) they decided that anyone from the sons of ʿAteʿaqab who steals from the temple [of Belastor …] (14) will have the rights of a member who will remain at the banquet in the banquet hall until […] (15) that if food is needed of the te[mp]le of Bel, then the sons of ʿAteʿaqab, the pries[ts…] (16) or for an offering to Belastor portions which will be determined for the members of the [*marzēaḥ* …] (17) will be determined among the community according to the [acc]ount and the other portions for a sign […] (18) to examine and to determine those who have sinned and to make an open[ing(?) …] (19) those who chan[ge(?) …] ? and from whomever has gone […] (20) from whomever […] first of those in […] (21) and who will be […] because …

Parts of this inscription are difficult to understand; nevertheless, it contains a surprisingly large amount of useful information. It shows that the *marzeaḥ* had two tutelary deities. A priest officiated as its head, a treasurer was responsible for the association's finances, and their members had to pay membership fees. If they did not fulfil certain obligations, they had to pay a fine. The congregation met in a hall of its own where they made offerings and partook of meals.

As other inscriptions make clear, there was not just one *marzeaḥ* in Palmyra, but different ones, the most important being that of the priests of Bel. Certainly the priests played an important role in the *marzeaḥ*, although it is currently debated to what extent the union whose charter is contained in PAT 0991 is one of lay men or priests. Especially with regard to *Ph30* it is of great interest that a *marzeaḥ* could have several tutelary

[66] Teixidor 1981: 306–308.
[67] Translation: McLaughlin 2001: 51f.

gods. It goes without saying that the organization and holding of meetings relied on a well-developed infrastructure: butchers, bakers, cooks, singers, waiters, and so on.

c. As to the archaeological evidence, a summary reference may suffice here:[68] The *temenoi* of the two main sanctuaries in Palmyra for Bel and Baalshamin have structures that allow them to be identified as banquet halls: they are equipped with brick biclinia and triclinia. Other banquet rooms cannot be identified as such with certainy, as they did not have brick lounges; probably the symposiasts sat down on mattresses.

The inscriptions found in Palmyra as well as the archaeological remains of the site convey a vivid image of the *marzeaḥ*, even if many points remain obscure, especially the exact liturgy of this cultic meal. In Palmyra, it is significant that the *marzeaḥ* was of great importance for the priests.

This might apply to Bostan esh-Sheikh as well, as can be shown on archaeological grounds: The fact that the back of the marble plaque of *Ph30* was roughly cut indicates that the inscription had originally been embedded in a wall of the building where the meetings of the various *marzeaḥ* guilds took place. Two different building complexes have the characteristics of meeting rooms for cultic gatherings: In the north of the sacred district there are two 'hestiatoria' of different sizes – in the grid square 5/18 a smaller hall with a rectangular podium for the mattresses of about 20 guests and in the grid squares 6-8/18-19 a larger hall for about 50 guests (**Fig. 3**). Probably the entire guilds or 'koina' of the cutlers (*Gr1*), the manufacturers of κλίναι (*Gr2*), and the sculptors or hairdressers (*Gr3*) met in these two 'hestiatoria' (see **Fig. 3** and **5**).[69]

For small-scale meetings, the clergy needed smaller rooms. These were probably situated in the 'Bâtiment aux frises d'enfants', a religious multifunctional building from the Hellenistic period. On the corridor between the side entrance in grid square 11/13 and the central courtyard rooms open on both sides, whose doors are moved from the center of the room to one of the sides. Thanks to the offset entrance, the interior of the walls could house four 'couches' (κλίναι) or bedsteads for the symposia and participants in the *marzeaḥ* (**Fig. 4** and **5**).

The immediate find-spot of the inscription near the 'Bâtiment aux frises d'enfants' suggests that the text was originally affixed to one of the walls of this building. In addition, the precise wording of the inscription

[68] Niehr 1998: 183–185 (with literature). For further details see Will 1997.
[69] Wachter 2005: 321 (*Gr1*), 322 (*Gr2*, *Gr 3*).

with the mention of the names of gods suggests a direct connection to the local clergy based there.

7. Concluding Remarks

Ph30 is a votive inscription, as its second word, *mš*, makes perfectly clear. However, as shown, it deviates considerably from other votive inscriptions, not only those found in Bostan esh-Sheikh.

The votive inscription *Ph30* was embedded in a wall. Whether or not it was identical with the votive offering cannot be ascertained. L. 5 of the inscription refers to an object set apart for the *marzeaḥ*, possibly a (valuable) bowl, drinking cup, or goblet (*sp*, l. 2), which could have been the votive offering. The term *marzeaḥ* suggests that the donor of the votive inscription is one of its members.

Ph30 is the first inscription from the Phoenician heartland found during a controlled excavation containing the term *mrzḥ*. It confirms what was to be expected from archeological and other considerations, namely the existence of this type of association in Bostan esh-Sheikh.

The inscription does not provide any information on the 'liturgy' of a *marzeaḥ* celebration, nor does it contain information of the kind found in the inscriptions from Palmyra, such as on the organization of the *marzeaḥ*, its facilities, etc. Its emphasis is clearly on the religious aspect. As is indicated by the meeting rooms near the place where the inscription was found and its reference to several deities, the *marzeaḥ* could be that of the local priesthood. With the exception of Baal, all of the deities also appear on the 'magical squares' of Bostan esh-Sheikh: Eshmun, Astarte, and Shamash. While the centrality of Eshmun and Astarte in Bostan esh-Sheikh had long been known, the discovery of the 'magical squares' showed that Shamash also held an important position in the sanctuary's pantheon, which is confirmed by the *marzeaḥ* inscription.



Fig. 3: Plan of the two Hestiatoria (Stucky 2005: Abb. 100).



Fig. 4: Plan of the 'Bâtiment aux frises d'enfants' (Stucky 2005: Abb. 98).



Fig. 5: Bostan esh-Sheikh, overall plan.

REFERENCES

Acquaro, Enrico, Ferruccio Barreca, Serena Maria Cecchini, D. Fantar, Muhammad Fantar, Maria Giulia Guzzo Amadasi, and Sabatino Moscati, 1969, *Ricerche puniche ad Antas. Rapporto preliminare della Missione archeologica dell'Università di Roma e della Soprintendenza alle Antichità di Cagliari* (Studi Semitici 30), Roma.

Aimé-Giron, Noël, 1938, Adversaria semitica: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 38*, 1–63, 4 planches.

Aimé-Giron, Noël, 1940, Adversaria Semitica (III). VII. Baʿal Ṣaphon et les dieux de Taḫpanḫès dans un nouveau papyrus phénicien: *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* XL, 433–460.

Al-Ghul, Omar, 1991, *Der Aufbau der nordwestsemitischen Weihinschriften (vom 10.–4. Jh. v.Chr.)*, Diss. Tübingen.

Ahlström, Gösta Werner, 1973, אדיר, in: *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament I*, 78–81.

Avigad, Nahman, 1964, Seals and Sealings: *Israel Exploration Journal* 14, 190–194.

Avigad, Nahman, and Jonas C. Greenfield, 1982, A Bronze *phialē* with a Phoenician Dedicatory Inscription: *Israel Exploration Journal* 32, 118–128.

Benz, Frank L., 1972, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Studia Pohl 8), Rome.

Bergmann, U., [3]1984, עזר, in: *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament II*, 256–259.

Berthier, André, and René Charlier, 1955, *Le sanctuaire punique d'El-Hofra à Constantine. Texte*, Paris.

Bonnet, Corinne, 1996, *Astarté. Dossier documentaire et perspectives historique*s (Contributi alla storia della religione fenicio-punica II. Collezione di studi fenici 37), Roma.

Chabot, Jean Baptiste, 1917, Punica. XVIII. Stèles puniques de Constantine: *Journal asiatique* sér. 11, t. X, 38–79.

CIS, 1881ff., *Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum*, Paris.

Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, and Joaquín Sanmartín, 2004, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part One : ['(a/i/u) – k]* (Handbook of Oriental Studies 67), Leiden/Boston.

Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, and Joaquín Sanmartín, 2004a, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part Two : [l – z]* (Handbook of Oriental Studies 67), Leiden/Boston.

Dietrich, Walter, and Samuel Arnet (eds.), 2013, *Konzise und aktualisierte Ausgabe des Hebräischen und Aramäischen Lexikons zum Alten Testament*, Leiden/Boston.

Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig, [3]1971, [3]1973, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. Band I: Texte, Band II: Kommentar*, Wiesbaden.

Dunand, Maurice, 1965, Nouvelles inscriptions phéniciennes du temple d'Echmoun à Bostan ech-Cheikh, près Sidon: *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* XVIII, 105–109.

Dunand, Maurice, 1970, La statuaire de la favissa du temple d'Echmoun à Sidon, in: Arnulf Kuschke and Ernst Kutsch (eds.), *Archäologie und Altes Testament. Festschrift für Kurt Galling zum 8. Januar 1970*, Tübingen, 61–67, 4 planches.

Friedrich, Johannes, and Wolfgang Röllig, 1999, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik*. 3rd ed., updated by Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo with the assistance of Walter R. Mayer (Analecta Orientalia 55), Rome.

Gibson, John C.L., 1982 (1998), *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. Volume III: Phoenician Inscriptions Including Inscriptions in the Mixed Dialect of Arslan Tash*, Oxford.

Gubel, Eric, 2002, *Art phénicien. La sculpture de tradition phénicienne*, Paris.

Guzzo Amadasi, Maria Giulia, 1987, Under Western Eyes: *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 4, 121–128, 1 plate.

Guzzo Amadasi, Maria Giulia, and Vassos Karageorghis, 1977, *Fouilles de Kition. III. Inscriptions phéniciennes*, Nicosia.

Healey, John F., 2001, *The Religion of the Nabataeans. A Conspectus* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 136), Leiden.

Hillers, Delbert R., and Eleonora Cussini, 1996, *Palmyrene Aramaic Texts*, Baltimore/London.

Hoftijzer, Jacob, and Karel Jongeling, 1995, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions* (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/21), Leiden/New York/Köln.

Ingholt, Harald, Henri Seyrig, Jean Starcky, and André Caquot, 1955, *Recueil des tessères de Palmyre* (Institut Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique LVIII), Paris.

KAI: see Donner, Herbert.

Knauf, Ernst Axel, 2003, Review of: McLaughlin, John L., 2001, *The MAR-ZĒAḤ in the Prophetic Literature. References and Allusions in Light of the Extra-Biblical Evidence* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum LXXXVI, Leiden, Boston, and Köln): *Bibliotheca Orientalis* LX, 419–421.

Krahmalkov, Charles Richard, 2000, *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary* (Studia Phoenicia XV. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 90), Leuven.

Kutter, Juliane, 2008, *nūr ilī. Die Sonnengottheiten in den nordwestsemitischen Religionen von der Spätbronzezeit bis zur vorrömischen Zeit* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 346), Münster.

Lagrange, Marie-Joseph, 1902a, Notes d'épigraphie sémitique: *Revue Biblique* 11, 94–99.

Lagrange, Marie-Joseph, 1902b, Note sur les inscriptions trouvées par Macridy-Bey à Bostan-Ech-Cheikh: *Revue Biblique* 11, 515–526, 6 plates.

Landau, Wilhelm Freiherr von, 1904, *Vorläufige Nachrichten über die im Eshmuntempel bei Sidon gefundenen phönizischen Altertümer. Mit Benutzung von Mitteilungen von Th. Macridy-bey und Hugo Winckler* (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft 9), Berlin.

Leslau, Wolf, 1991, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic). Ge'ez-English / English-Ge'ez*, Wiesbaden.

Lidzbarski, Mark, 1898, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik nebst ausgewählten Inschriften*, Weimar.

Lidzbarski, Mark, 1912, *Phönizische und aramäische Krugaufschriften aus Elephantine*, Berlin.

Lipiński, Edward, 1992, Eshmun, in: *Dictionnaire de la civilisation phénicienne et punique*, 158–160.

Lipiński, Edward, 1995, *Dieux et déesses de l'univers phénicien et punique* (Studia Phoenicia XIV. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 64), Leuven.

Mathys, Hans-Peter, 2005, Die phönizischen Inschriften, in: Rolf A. Stucky, *Das Eschmun-Heiligtum von Sidon. Architektur und Inschriften*. Unter Mitarbeit von Sigmund Stucky und mit Beiträgen von Antonio Loprieno, Hans-Peter Mathys und Rudolf Wachter (Antike Kunst Beiheft 19), Basel, 273–318.

Mathys, Hans-Peter, 2008, *Das Astarte-Quadrat*, Zürich.

Mathys, Hans-Peter, and Rolf A. Stucky, 2018, Inscriptions phéniciennes provenant du sanctuaire d'Echmoun à Bostan esh-Sheikh près de Sidon: *Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL* 18, 363–378.

McLaughlin, John L., 2001, *The MARZĒAḤ in the Prophetic Literature. References and Allusions in Light of the Extra-Biblical Evidence* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum LXXXVI), Leiden/Boston/Köln.

Mullen, Everett T., 1974, A New Royal Sidonian Inscription: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 216, 25–30.

Niehr, Herbert, 1998, *Religionen in Israels Umwelt. Einführung in die nordwestsemitischen Religionen Syrien-Palästinas* (Die Neue Echter Bibel. Ergänzungsband 5 zum Alten Testament), Würzburg.

Payne Smith, Jessie, 1998, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith*, Winona Lake.

Peckham, J. Brian, 1968, *The Development of the Late Phoenician Scripts* (Harvard Semitic Series XX), Cambridge.

Renan, Ernest, 1891, Inscription phénicienne inédite de Sidon: *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* II, 75–77.

Renz, Johannes, and Wolfgang Röllig, 1995, *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik, Bd. III: Texte und Tafeln*, Darmstadt.

Röllig, Wolfgang, 1969–1970, Beiträge zur nordsemitischen Epigraphik (1–4): *Die Welt des Orients* V, 108–126.

Seyrig, Henri, 1940, Les tessères palmyréniennes et le banquet rituel, in: *Mémorial Lagrange, Cinquantenaire de l'École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem*, Paris, 51–58.

Stucky, Rolf A., 1993, *Die Skulpturen aus dem Eschmun-Heiligtum bei Sidon. Griechische, römische, kyprische und phönizische Statuen und Reliefs vom 6. Jahrhundert vor Chr. bis zum 3. Jahrhundert nach Chr.* (Antike Kunst Beiheft 17), Basel.

Stucky, Rolf A., 2005, *Das Eschmun-Heiligtum von Sidon. Architektur und Inschriften.* Unter Mitarbeit von Sigmund Stucky und mit Beiträgen von Antonio Loprieno, Hans-Peter Mathys und Rudolf Wachter (Antike Kunst Beiheft 19), Basel.

Stucky, Rolf Andreas, and Hans-Peter Mathys, 2000, Le sanctuaire sidonien d'Echmoun. Aperçu historique du site, des fouilles et des découvertes faites à Bostan ech-Cheikh: *Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL* 4, 123–148.

Teixidor, Javier, 1981, Le thiase de Bêlastor et de Beelshamên d'après une inscription récemment découverte à Palmyre: *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 125, 306–314.

Teixidor, Javier, 1986, *Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique (1964–1980)* (Institut français d'archéologie du Proche-Orient Beyrouth – Damas – Amman. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique CXXVII), Paris.

Uberti, Maria Luisa, 1980, Una dedica a Sid: *Epigraphica: Rivista Italiana di Epigrafia* XLII, 195–197.

Vanel, Antoine, 1967, Six « ostraca » phéniciens trouvés au temple d'Echmoun, près de Saïda: *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* XX, 45–95, Pl. I–VI.

Vanel, Antoine, 1969, Le septième ostracon phénicien trouvé au temple d'Echmoun, près de Saïda (Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph XLV/20), Beyrouth, 345–364.

Von Soden, Wolfram, 1972, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. II M–S*, Wiesbaden.

Von Soden, Wolfram, 1981, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. III Ṣ–Z. Berichtigungen und Nachträge*, Wiesbaden.

Wachter, Rudolf, 2005, Die griechischen Inschriften, in: Rolf A. Stucky, *Das Eschmun-Heiligtum von Sidon. Architektur und Inschriften*. Unter Mitarbeit von Sigmund Stucky und mit Beiträgen von Antonio Loprieno, Hans-Peter Mathys und Rudolf Wachter (Antike Kunst Beiheft 19), Basel, 319–332.

Wehr, Hans, [5]1985, *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Arabisch–Deutsch. Unter Mitwirkung von Lorenz Kropfitsch neu bearbeitet und erweitert, Wiesbaden.

Westermann, Claus, 1978, *Theologie des Alten Testaments in Grundzügen* (Grundrisse zum Alten Testament. Das Alte Testament Deutsch Ergänzungsreihe 6), Göttingen.

Will, Ernest, 1997, Les salles de banquet de Palmyre et d'autres lieux: *Topoi* 7/2, 873–887, 5 planches.

Xella, Paolo, 1993, Eschmun von Sidon: Der phönizische Asklepios, in: Manfried Dietrich and Oswald Loretz (eds.), *Mesopotamica – Ugaritica – Biblica. Festschrift K. Bergerhof*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 481–498.

Yon, Jean-Baptiste, and Catherine Apicella, 2005, Inscriptions de Sidon conservées à Byblos: *Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL* 9, 291–299.

THE PERSIAN AND EARLY HELLENISTIC PERIODS AT TEL DOR

S. Rebecca Martin

Around 500 BCE, during a period of Sidonian rule, the tell of Dor was occupied for the first time in over 100 years. Despite the gap in the site's occupation, the new residents were aware of and, in some cases seem to have exploited, late Iron Age structures. Two occupational sequences on the tell, one overlooking the southern harbor and the other in the eastern area that includes the main city gate, show that during the 5th century BCE, houses and streets were constructed in a way that followed the old contours of the tell, while incorporating some new elements of design. In the 4th century BCE, elaboration of houses and streets left the site effectively unfortified. From the beginning of this period, the inhabitants at Dor looked out toward the Mediterranean for a rich array of imported objects and imagery.

The conquest of Alexander in the 330s BCE marked the political transition from Achaemenid to Macedonian rule, but Dor does not appear to have been immediately affected. The southern and eastern occupational sequences on the tell both indicate that major architectural changes appear only two generations later. Numismatic evidence ties the new monumental constructions to the reign of Ptolemy II (r. 285–246 BCE), who, around the time of the First Syrian War, turned Dor into a strategic military site by constructing a major city wall, artillery towers, and a large building complex for apparently related purposes. Dor's fortunes were changed by these actions, with the result that the site was besieged during two different Successor skirmishes that occurred in the later 3rd and mid-2nd centuries BCE. A variety of images, including the ideologically-charged coins of the Ptolemies, are part of daily life in early Hellenistic Dor, but images never again reach the scale and scope seen in the Persian period.

1. Introduction

It is still common for surveys of Near Eastern history and archaeology to stop at Alexander's conquest of the 330s (e.g., Kuhrt 1995; Steiner and Killebrew 2014; compare Markoe 2000; Meyers and Chancey 2014), implying that the political shift from Achaemenid to Macedonian rule was also a cultural breaking point with instantaneous and profound affects. Most sites in Phoenicia bear no scars from the conquest, however, and show no immediate changes to daily life. The



Fig. 1: Plan of excavated areas at Tel Dor from 2000–2018 (Courtesy of Tel Dor Project).

site of Tel Dor (**Fig. 1**) is a useful case study of how the transition from Achaemenid to Macedonian domination is and is not archaeologically evident, thanks to its record of well-preserved sequences stretching from the Persian period into the early Hellenistic period (and beyond).[1] Dor allows us to consider what urban

[1] Systematic investigations of the *tell* began in 1980 under Ephraim Stern and lasted until 2000. The renewed Tel Dor project began in 2003 under the directorships of Ayelet Gilboa and Ilan

life was like under the Achaemenids, and when, how, and why changes occurred following the Macedonian conquest – all of which permits us to understand better the production and reception of images addressed by this volume.

I make several claims in this paper about the Persian and early Hellenistic periods at Tel Dor that can be summarized here. I believe that the development of Persian Dor was gradual. There was no major modification of the *tell* or its harbors to enhance its naturally strategic location. So, while having a friendly port at Dor might have been useful for the Achaemenids and Sidonians who oversaw the region, they seem to have taken a mostly passive role after the site's resettlement that began around 500 BCE. The commercial connections of Persian-period Dor are reflected in its image-bearing objects, the majority of which were imported, even while the contexts of their consumption – from town and house planning to building techniques – show continuity with existing Iron Age practices. I walk through occupational sequences in two key areas of the *tell*, one residential, the other containing the city wall/gate as well as domestic blocks, to show that in the Hellenistic period, both areas were radically altered as part of a single imperial initiative. The late Persian-early Hellenistic archaeological transition lags behind political change by two generations. I date its start to the time of the First Syrian War or shortly thereafter on the strength of numismatic evidence. By this time, the previous main source of images – figure-decorated pottery from Athens – had ceased to be produced[2] and the importation of Egyptian amulets had nearly ended, as well. Although terracotta figurines, some of which were likely produced in the area, continued to be used at the site in some quantity, the imported figure-decorated pottery and amulets were not fully replaced by other classes of image-bearing objects such as coins, with the result that there were comparatively fewer images at early Hellenistic Dor.

2. Tel Dor

The *tell* of Dor is located in what is now northern coastal Israel, approximately 80 km south of Tyre. Dor is securely associated with Biblical *D'r* (Jos 17:11; 1 Kg 4:11) and *Dwr* (Jos 11:2, 12:23; Jdg 1:27; 1 Chr 7:29), spelled as *Dōros* and *Dōra* in Greek-language sources of the Persian and Hellenistic periods (cited in Steph. Byz. s.v. Dōros). The site seems to have been occupied almost continuously

Sharon, and since 2016 also includes the author and Assaf Yasur-Landau (http://dor.huji.ac.il/). The author thanks Nicholas Hudson, Sveta Matskevich, Barak Monnickendam-Givon, Jessica Nitschke, Roi Sabar, and Ilan Sharon for their contributions, as well as the generous volume editors and attendees of the conference in which this work was first presented in Bern. All errors remain my own.

[2] Black-gloss vessels form Attika were no longer imported to Dor, either, possibly because of Ptolemaic economic policies: Stewart and Martin 2003: 90–91.

from the Middle Bronze Age through the early 3rd century CE, by which time the main area of occupation had moved down the slopes of the mound, extending eastward and northward. In all excavation areas, a break in the occupational sequence consistently appears beginning in or just before 630 BCE and lasting until 500 BCE. Textual and archaeological evidence dating to the Persian and Hellenistic periods indicates that Dor was reoccupied mainly by people we would identify as Phoenicians. Urbanization seems to have been a gradual process beginning with a small-scale occupation that followed the later Iron Age city plan despite the occupational gap. During the 5th century BCE, the layout of the town was established; even as the town grew, occupation along the same urban contours was continuous into the 4th and early 3rd centuries. The next major changes to the urban fabric of Dor appeared in the second quarter of the 3rd century BCE when the city was substantially fortified for the first time since the Iron Age and large-scale structures replaced domestic ones that had overlooked the southern harbor.

3. Dor in the Persian Period

Sometime shortly after the mid-7th century BCE the ceramic sequence at Dor tails off (Gilboa 2018: 167–168). Only a very few finds seem to pre-date circa 500 BCE, which suggests that the site was irregularly occupied or abandoned around the time of the fall of the Neo-Assyrian empire, through the Babylonian period, and during the first generation of the Achaemenid empire. The reoccupation of Dor is archaeologically attested by imports, mostly Attic pottery and Aegean transport amphorae (Shalev and Martin 2012; Martin and Shalev 2022). The new occupants of Dor were subject to Sidonian rule according to our best extant testimony, the 22-line inscription on the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar II of Sidon. It is written that "the lord of kings" gave the ruler of Sidon: "Dor [*d'r*] and Joppa [*ypy*], the rich lands of Dagon/corn that are in the plain of Sharon, as a reward for the striking deeds that I performed" (KAI 14: lines 18–20, translation after Gibson 1982: 105–114).

"The lord of kings" refers to an unnamed Achaemenid king. There is scholarly disagreement about his identity and about the date of the Eshmunazar's reign, but it is likely that the inscription dates to a time shortly following circa 525 BCE and the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses to which the Phoenicians contributed (Her. 3.19). The sarcophagus may have been looted at this time, and it is probable that Eshmunazar's father Tabnit was involved in the Egyptian campaign (Martin 2017: 106; Martin and Shalev 2022: 112).

Even with disagreement about the inscription's date, it is reasonable to interpret the sarcophagus' inscription as a window into the political organization of

southern Phoenicia in the early Persian period. The arrangement described therein reveals part of a broader Achaemenid approach in which the most powerful Phoenician city state, Sidon, was granted control over specific regions in exchange for naval support. In return, Sidon gained lucrative trade routes, ports, and, possibly, agricultural hinterland. Sidon ruled the area from Dor to Jaffa, and Tyre apparently controlled the area immediately south of it as well as some coastal sites (Akko, Ashkelon; see Tal 2005: especially 89; for Kedesh, see Herbert and Berlin 2003: 46–48; Katzenstein 1979). These Phoenician- and Persian-controlled territories ensured essential access to Egypt.

The archaeological record indicates that the resettlement of Dor probably occurred during the rule of the Sidonian king Bodaštart (Martin and Shalev 2022: 112–113). The new residents were already part of long-distance trading networks, but the town took some time to develop (compare to Stern 1995c: 272). Several major regional events are reported in the ancient sources. The revolts of Inaros against Artaxerxes in the 5th century BCE (Thuc. 1.104) and, in the 4th century BCE, the so-called Satrap's revolt (Diod. Sic. 15.90–15.94) and Tennes Rebellion (Diod. Sic. 16.41–16.52) might have impacted Dor, but direct archaeological evidence is so far lacking.

4. The Eastern Tell in the Persian Period (Dor Areas A and C 'Strata V–VI')

To trace the Persian-early Hellenistic sequence at Dor, we begin with a brief sketch of the fully-published Areas A and C on the eastern side of the *tell* (**Fig. 1**; Stern 1995a–b; see also Stern 2001: 464–466). The Persian period town plan was established through a gradual process of small-scale constructions in two main phases (Shalev and Martin 2012 *contra* Stern 1995d: 29–34 regarding 'Stratum VI' in Areas A and C). In the earliest Persian phase ('Stratum VI'), the new residents of Dor dug pits, built houses, and created at least one street (Stern 1995d: 33, Plan 4.2). While we do not know how much of the Iron Age city wall was still standing after the long occupational gap, people could still see where it had been built, as the earliest houses go up to but do not cover the wall. This arrangement seems to have persisted through the 5th century BCE.

Sometime ca. 400 BCE (the beginning of 'Stratum V'), a new phase is indicated by expanded construction of houses and the creation of a second street (Stern 1995d: 34–38, especially Plans 4.3–4.4). The streets are parallel, maintain a regular width, and follow the existing line of the *tell*. It is apparent that the designers of the new town looked back to the contour planning found at Dor in the Iron Age, while adding to it some features of orthogonally-arranged sites (Shalev and Martin 2012: especially 94–95). The houses of this second Persian

phase are now in clear units measuring approximately 15 m between the parallel streets (limited exposure means their lengths are not known). Two rows of residences were built across the width of the block, creating some small houses of approximately 7.5 square meters (compare to the 'Phoenician House' in Dor Area C: Sharon 1995: 92–94, Fig. 5.9, Photo 5.52). Critically for our understanding of Persian Dor, in this second Persian phase we see the construction of houses on top of the line of the Iron Age city wall. The back walls of the easternmost houses created a continuous feature of about one-meter thickness, sometimes referred to in publications as the 'casemate wall' or 'city wall' (Stern 1988: 9–11, Fig. 2; Stern 1995d: 37). Many small changes in construction technique and orientation indicate that these walls were not built all at once, however, and thus the 'city wall' was created only gradually, if deliberately, through side-by-side house construction. As will be discussed below, the Iron Age city gate also went out of use at this time, meaning that Dor was effectively unfortified in the 4th century BCE (*contra* Grainger 2010: 97). This unfortified arrangement persisted into the early Hellenistic period.

5. The Gate Area in the Persian Period (Dor Area B Phases 4–5b)

Area B is just south of Areas A and C. It was the site of the town's main landward gate beginning in the Ir2a: first a four-chambered gate (Dor Area B/7) and then, in the Ir2c, a two-chambered one (Dor Area B/5c) built directly on the same spot (**Fig. 2**).[3] Although no formal study of this area's Persian or Hellenistic period stratigraphy has been conducted, we can still observe its stratigraphic sequence through its superimposed gates and by linking it to Areas A and C.[4] Like Areas A and C, Area B is characterized by slow growth that begins with the limited reuse of (or awareness of) Iron Age structures (Phases B/5a–b), followed by a second Persian phase (Phase B/4) in which the gate falls out of use.

The earliest Persian phase in Area B (Phase B/5a–b) had only scanty remains of new architecture (some units showed signs of rebuilding within this period, hence the 'a' and 'b' distinction). Once again, residents were aware of the two-chambered gate and its offset-inset wall, as no building covered them and they still served as the eastern edge of the *tell*. Stern's claim that these Ir2c features fully fortified the Persian town until it was "razed by the Persians during the first

[3] Area B was excavated from 1980–95. Gilboa et al., forthcoming, updates Stern 1995c: 271–272 and Stern 1995d: 29. See Stern 1980, 1982a–b, 1983, 1985; Stern, Gilboa, and Sharon 1989, 1992; Stern and Sharon 1983, 1986, 1987, 1993, 1995; Stern, Berg, Gilboa, et al. 1997. For the Ir1 city wall, see Matskevich, Gilboa, and Sharon 2014: especially Fig. 7.

[4] A preliminary study of the post-Iron Age levels of Area B has been conducted by Ilan Sharon whom the author thanks for sharing **Fig. 2** and assisting with this discussion.


❶Roman Pavement (Phase 1 & 2)
❷Main Roman drain
❸Hellenistic City Wall (Phase 3)
❹Two Chambered Gate (Phase 5)
❺Four Chambered Gate (Phase 7)
❻Boulder Offset-Inset Wall (Phase 7-5)
❼Inner wall of Phase 5
❽Inner wall of Phase 7
❾Mud-brick City Wall
❿Iron Age IIA walls, earlier than the gate
⓫Pit 3320 (Phase 5?/6?)
⓬Pit?/Chamber? 7219 (Phase 6?/7?)
⓭W7016, Phase 6

Fig. 2: Schematic reconstruction and section of gate sequence of Dor Area B from the Ir2a four-chambered gate through the Roman gate (Courtesy of Ilan Sharon and the Tel Dor Project).

Phoenician revolt" around 400 BCE is not, however, supported by the evidence (here: Stern 1995d: 29; see also Stern 1995c: 273; Stern 1988: 8–9, where the destruction is associated with the Tennes Rebellion). How much of the Ir2c gate and the offset-inset wall was standing is not known and no destruction layer marks their end; time and urban renewal are the likely causes for their decay and replacement.

Around 400 BCE, at the same time as the laying out of streets and construction of domestic blocks in 'Stratum VI' of Areas A and C to the north, we see the first major new Persian construction in Area B. The Ir2c two-chambered gate went out of use at this time, when the new houses were built over it. Continued awareness of the gate's location is signaled by the simple opening between housing blocks in the same area that served as an entry/exit point to the town (Stern 1995d: 37, Fig. 4.2).

Throughout the 4th century BCE and into the third, the 'gate' of Dor was whittled down to a controlled passageway. The arrangement would not have afforded protection against military action, but it could have allowed the people of Dor to control the flow of traffic from outside the town into its street system. It is interesting to consider why no new gate or substantial city wall was built at

this time. One possibility is that the need for security was low, as Dor was a mostly small town of little political importance. Another is that Dor's Sidonian rulers did not allow the site to refortify itself, would not pay for it (and the residents could not afford it), or simply did not bother with it. Still another possibility – and not a mutually exclusive one – is that it was advantageous for Dor to remain unfortified, as Dor could not have adequately defended itself against military action even with a more robust fortification system. The last idea probably contributed to Dor staying out of major political and military events in this period including, as we will see below, the arrival of Alexander's armies in the region.

7. The Southern Harbor Area in the Persian Period (Dor Area D2 Phases 5a–c)

The area of Dor overlooking the southern harbor (Dor Area D1–5) is mostly unpublished but well-studied.[5] It has a simpler but related Persian sequence compared to what we have seen so far. The earliest evidence of Persian-period occupation in Area D2 (tentatively ascribed to Phase D2/5c) comes from houses. In the second main Persian phase (Phases D2/5a–b), we see expansion of the houses as well as remodeling.

6.1. *Phase D2/5c*

The earliest remains are scanty traces of houses and associated pits. The pits contain some of the earliest dateable Persian-period material at Dor, including, as would be expected, material from the Iron Age deposits the pits are cutting. The most common finds are pottery for drinking and dining, but there are also some contents, such as storage jars and crushed murex, that might point to commercial or religious activities.

[5] Areas D1 and D2 were excavated from 1984–present and were subsequently expanded and redefined to include Areas D3–D5. Stratigraphy in Area D2 was completed by Talia Goldman, Yiftah Shalev, Sveta Matskevich, and Ilan Sharon. See (noting that the structure frequently referred to as "Persian" was later recognized as Hellenistic) Stern 1985; Stern and Sharon 1986, 1987; Stern, Gilboa, and Sharon 1989; Stern, Berg, and Sharon 1991; Stern and Sharon 1993, 1995; Stern, Berg, Gilboa et al. 1997; Stern, Gilboa, Sharon, et al. 2000; Stern, Gilboa, and Sharon 2000; Stern, Sharon et al. 2000; Sharon, Gilboa, and Karasik 2006; Sharon, Gilboa et al. 2009; Sharon, Gilboa, and Shalev 2009a–b, 2010, 2011; Gilboa, Stern, and Shalev 2014: Matskevich, Gilboa, and Sharon 2014.

6.2. *Phases D2/5a–b*



Fig. 3: Schematic reconstruction of Persian-period streets and housing blocks in Dor Area D2 (Courtesy of Yiftah Shalev).

Following the small-scale occupation signaled by the earliest houses and pits, Area D is further developed and more urbanized. In Phase D2/5b, more houses were built. The area was divided by perpendicular but not strictly orthogonal streets (*contra* Stern 2001: 461–464) of approximately 2.0–2.5 m in width (**Fig. 3**). Although no housing blocks were fully preserved, they seem to have been similar in size to those on the eastern side of the *tell*, discussed above (Shalev 2009). The streets were probably not all constructed at the same time, but no houses or other structures encroached upon them. Each house was divided into just a few spaces, possibly a courtyard and two small rooms supporting a second story.[6] In the next phase (Phase D2/5a), the overall form of houses and the layout of streets were maintained, but some reorganization of spaces inside the houses is evident.

7. Images in Persian Period Dor

In this period, Dor's residents imported objects from three main areas in the eastern Mediterranean (**Fig. 4**): the Aegean (Attic pots and Aegean transport amphorae); central Phoenicia, southern Asia Minor, and Cyprus (terracotta figurines and other small-scale statuary, banded pottery); and Egypt (faience amulets, notably). While some popular objects bearing images, such as clay figurines,

[6] Although Stern (2001: 468) calls the type by another name, 'the open-court house', the Persian period houses at Dor are smaller and simpler than the larger Hash-Planned House type published in Gilboa, Sharon, and Zorn 2014: especially 47, 67–68, 72.

were made closer to home – if not at Dor itself – the majority of the images used by residents was imported, with Attic black- and red-figure pottery supplying the greatest quantity of imagery (Stewart and Martin 2005).

Examples of Attic pottery at Dor painted with images are found nearly exclusively on drinking cups of various types and mixing kraters, a consumption pattern seen at other coastal *tells* in the area (Martin 2014a). While we must be sensitive to possible differences between the intended function of these vessels and how they were used at Dor, it is nonetheless important to note how limited a range of functions these forms had with respect to the full repertoire of Attic vessels. Dor's is one of the biggest corpora of Attic pottery in Israel known to this author, second only to Ashkelon.[7] The earliest imports date to around 500 BCE. They increase steadily after 475 BCE with a peak in terms of quantity and variety around 350 BCE, which is followed by a fairly rapid drop off as production of these pots declines in the later 4th century BCE (Stewart and Martin 2005: especially 90–91). No workshops or themes dominate outside those subjects that are common in the Attic repertoire, but explicitly athletic scenes do not seem especially popular (as noted in Nunn 2014: 414). It is therefore unlikely that customers determined the subjects, styles, or workshops that were offered to them – although this did happen elsewhere, in the Etruscan market (Bundrick 2019).

Scholarship on Attic painted pottery found in the eastern Mediterranean lags behind other regions, so a few additional observations are needed here. Attic black-figure pottery only appears at Dor a generation after the invention of red figure, a time when much black figure was mass-produced, often carelessly. The relative popularity of low-quality black figure at Dor and elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean is a reflection of the marketplace rather than deliberate targeting of "unsophisticated" consumers with low-quality work (*contra* Nunn 2014: 414 following Shefton 2000: 79). Some black-figure pottery at Dor was of very high quality, such as the fragmentary cup seen in **Fig. 4** (top left) showing Herakles wrestling the Nemean lion – but it is rare (Reg. Nos. 52413 and 169168, L16759 + 52413; Stewart and Martin 2005: 83, Fig. 3). Red-figure pots are not especially common at Dor, either, and they are of mixed quality, from the very low end (cups by the Pithos Painter) to middling and even high-quality products. Merchants probably selected pottery according to vessel function(s) and what was available in bulk, while the iconographic content and quality of imagery were secondary.

[7] The corpus from Ashkelon is currently under study by the author and Jennifer Tafe. Akko should also have a large corpus, but it is for the most part unpublished.

Fig. 4: Image-bearing objects from Persian-period Dor were mostly imported. From top to bottom: a fine example of a black-figure Attic cup from Area D (Reg. Nos. 52413 and 169168, L16759 + 52413), part of a 'temple boy' resting his hand on a turtle from Area B (Reg. No. 2658?, L228), an Egyptian Tawaret amulet of a necklace from Area D (Reg. No. 167090-1, L16411), and the left eye of a Phoenician mask from Area D (Reg. No. 170876, L17072). Images not to scale (All images courtesy of Tel Dor Project [d19Z3-0122]).

All the faience amulets found at Dor are imports from Egypt (Herrmann 2010: 225). Some 90 Persian-period amulets have been published to date (some could belong to the later Iron Age). The most popular subjects at Dor are also among the most popular in the Mediterranean, notably Tawaret, the papyrus stem, and the Udjat-eye. Some were worn together on necklaces.[8] The Tawaret amulet illustrated in **Fig. 4** (middle) from Area D is thought to come from a single necklace of eight amulets: in addition to the Tawaret, the necklace had a Khnum, Heh/Shu, ram, bull, lion, monkey, and papyrus stem (Reg. Nos. 167090/1–8; Herrmann 2010: 227, Chart 8 top). Other small-scale sculptures, such as seals, are also found at Persian Dor, but in relatively small numbers compared to earlier periods (Stern 2000: 190–192). Most show male figures in domination of animals (but see Schroer in this volume *contra* Stern 1995b: 476–478).

The people of Dor also imported objects from central Phoenicia, southern Asia Minor, and Cyprus. While the decorative scheme of pottery from these areas was geometric (e.g., Shalev 2014: 212–218; Lehmann et al. 2019), some other objects bore imagery, such as the decorated bovine scapula from Area D2 inscribed with Cypro-syllabic and a maritime scene (Stern 1994). The terracottas from Persian-period Dor, some of which seem to have been produced locally (although how 'locally' is difficult to say at this stage), underscore the extent to which people at the site were receptive to varied imagery (Nunn 2000). Two of the fragmentary masks recovered from Area D2 (Reg. No. 170876, L17072: **Fig. 4**, bottom), for example, take the form of the head of the gorgon Medusa (Reg. No. 170876: Martin 2014b: 290, No. 2, Fig. 2). The type is popular in Greek architectural terracottas but seems to undergo a significant functional reinterpretation when translated from a decorative roof tile to a mask. One of the Area D2 masks was subjected to petrography, which showed that it was made in Phoenicia using clay from the region between Tyre and Sidon or north of Tripoli (Martin 2014b: 290, No. 1, Fig. 1; petrography conducted by Anat Cohen-Weinberger).

Nineteen Persian period and early Hellenistic figurines, mostly fragmentary, were found near one another in Area B and give us further insight into the significance of terracottas of this period (Martin 2007: 189–193, No. 1 with comments regarding Stern 1982b; Stern 2010: 5–8). The types include males in Achaemenid style dress, a female plaque, typical Phoenician pregnant females, a 'temple boy' (Reg. No. 2658?, L228: **Fig. 4**, top right; Stern 2010: 17, Fig. 17: 4, where it is mislabeled as coming from Area D2), a comically obscene female (a so-called Baubo), a standing female wearing Greek clothing, and two

[8] The most spectacular example is a necklace from Area B found in a Persian context and made of 16 amulets (all Reg. No. 70336) dated by Herrmann to the later Iron Age. See: Stern and Sharon 1987: Pl. 27B; Stern 2000: 179, Fig. 111; Herrmann 2010: 227, Chart 8 bottom.

fragments of Cypriot chalk statuettes. The figurines from Area B show a remarkable range of imagery: males evocative of mature deities or heroes; female deities of the type usually associated with fertility cult; and the 'temple boy' and standing chalk statuette showing a youth, both of which can be associated with Cyprus and with Eshmun, as at Bostan esh-Sheik (Stucky 1993, 29–38, 83–92, Nos. 98–158, Pls. 23–35.). Altogether, over 250 figurines and around two dozen terracotta masks, most fragmentary, have been excavated from Persian levels at Dor (Stern 2010: 24–30, Figs. 29–32; Pls. 17–19). We no longer have reason to suspect that these finds are vestiges of formal temples (Martin 2014b: especially 292–293). Most were found in domestic deposits, often in pits, indicative of personal or familial ritual activities.

In sum, objects bearing images were a very important part of daily life at Dor in the Persian period to a degree that is exceptional relative to earlier and later periods. Most imagery was imported, coming from various points in the eastern Mediterranean, and is thus evidence of outward-looking behaviors. Dorians were not 'looking out' in just one direction, as they used objects with a mixture of gods, monsters, and heroes, from Tawaret to Medusa to Eshmun. While we cannot say how much Dorians cared about specific images – especially in the case of Attic pottery – we should not underestimate the impact of imagery on everyday life, especially in contexts when the other main form of visual communication, writing, was rare.

8. Dor in the Hellenistic Period

Alexander's forces crossed into Asia Minor in 334 BCE and in the next year met Darius III at Issos (Diod. Sic. 17). Shortly thereafter Alexander advanced to Egypt, where he consulted the oracle of Ammon at Siwah in 332 BCE (Arr. 3.3–3.4) before marching northward again to meet Darius in 331 BCE at Gaugamela. A year later he had sacked Persepolis, and Achaemenid rule came to its definitive end. Like most Phoenician polities, Dor was not directly involved in these episodes (Berlin 1997a: 5; Tal 2006). We have reason to believe that Dor maintained a "continuous historical consciousness" of its Phoenician identity through the transition in imperial rule and for a very long time thereafter (here: Millar 1983: 66; see Claudius Iolaus ap. Steph. Byz., s.v. Dōros). At the same time, the changes brought about by the shift in power were surely significant for Dorians. The period following the early death of Alexander in 323 was chaotic, not least of all in Phoenicia, which was regularly traversed by Alexander's Successors with sometimes disastrous consequences (Diod. Sic. 19.93; Grainger 1991). After 301 BCE, however, control of this region was mostly in the hands of Ptolemy (Diod. Sic. 21.1.5) who had declared himself king a few years prior,

ushering in a period of relative stability as well as new policies that reshaped daily life (Berlin 1997b).

Polybios states that, in 219 BCE, Dor was brought directly into in the renewed Ptolemaic-Seleukid conflict when Antiochos III laid siege to the town, unsuccessfully (Pol. 5.66). Antiochos' failure to take Dor assures us that the mostly unfortified 4th-century BCE arrangement – with houses in a row functioning as a 'wall' and the gap between them as a 'gate' – was replaced by 219 BCE. Surely this new Hellenistic city wall is what Josephus was referring to when he described Dor as a "fortress" (Jos. Ant. Iud. 13.7.2). Because 'passive defense' relying on walls alone was totally insufficient against the siege equipment and military tactics of the Hellenistic era (McNicoll and Milner 1997: 214–215), a substantial number of troops must have been stationed in the town, too, during this episode.

It was the defeat of Ptolemaic forces near Banias in ca. 197 BCE by Antiochos III that finally brought the area under Seleukid control (Jos. Ant. Iud. 12.3–4). The 2nd century saw the rise and then the weakening of Seleukid power in the region. In the second half of the century, territorial disputes resumed. In 139/8 BCE, Dor was besieged for the second time, by Antiochos VII Sidetes, again unsuccessfully (1 Macc 15: 10–14, 25–27; Jos. Ant. Iud. 13.7.2; Jos. BI 1.2.2). This second siege tells us that the Seleukids, too, maintained Dor's fortifications and had occasion to garrison troops in the town. It is not clear how, in the late 2nd century, Dor came to be controlled by the tyrant Zoilos, but succession crises were at least in part to blame. Alexander Jannaeus (r. 103–76 BCE) may have wrestled control of these cities away from Zoilos around 100 BCE (see Jos. Ant. Iud. 13.12.2). The next recorded event in Dor's history is in 64/3 BCE, when Dor appears on a list of cities granted autonomy by Pompey under the authority of the Roman governor (Jos. Ant. Iud. 14.4.4; Jos. BI 1.7.7). It was only in the Roman period that the early Hellenistic wall system was significantly modified (see **Fig. 8**, right).

9. The Early Hellenistic Transition

The first construction of the Hellenistic period ties together all the areas at Dor discussed thus far.

9.1. *Areas A and C*

The second Persian phase ('Stratum V') in Areas A and C is long-lived, stretching from ca. 400 past the conquest of the region by Alexander. The first

construction of the Hellenistic period ('Stratum IV') is a major one in which the unfortified arrangement of the 4th century BCE was replaced with a major city wall (Stern 1995d: 39, especially Plan 4.5). This construction had the effect of reshaping the easternmost contours of the *tell*, as the new wall was built inside the line of the previous construction (**Figs. 2** and **5**).

The new wall was substantial, measuring from 2–3.5 m thick–more than double the width of the previous 'city wall' formed by adjoining houses. It was outfitted with at least two artillery towers appearing approximately 30 m apart in Areas A2 and C1 (Sharon 1991; Stern 1988: 13; Stern 1995c: especially 277–278; Stern 1995d: especially 38–42). It is likely the towers continued northwest along the unexcavated perimeter of the *tell*. More than 200 artillery stones have been found at the site, mostly in Area B north and especially south of the gate in the salient ('bastion'), offering further evidence of active defense of the town (CIIP 2: No. 2138; Shatzman 1995; Stern 1982a: 116; Stern 2000: 208–210, Figs. 139–140; Stern, Berg, and Sharon 1991: 51; Stern, Gilboa, and Sharon 1992: 41–43, Figs. 7–8). Although we know little about the superstructure of these towers, their roughly 10 x 10 m foundations are large enough to have supported tall structures with multiple catapults.

This kind of fortification system – in which the city wall was positioned to take advantage of an existing scarp and had frequent towers, jogs, and salients to create further opportunity for active defense – was used by the Successors, in many variations, to withstand mechanized assault (McNicoll and Milner 1997: 213). It is not known where else the *tell* was walled, but defense against naval attacks was surely important on the southern and western sides of the town. Towers might have been part of this scheme, too, as land-based catapults had been used against ships at least since the beginning of the 4th century BCE (Diod. Sic. 14.50.4), and wooden towers were reportedly part of the Tyrian defense against Alexander (Arr. 2.21.1; Diod. Sic. 17.41.3; see also Pliny Nat. Hist. 7.201).[9] Houses were still a part of the eastern side of the *tell*, but the city wall had strategically raised and reshaped the perimeter (**Figs. 2** and **5**). The easternmost housing blocks (which had measured 15 m deep) were now across the street from the city wall. The relatively shallow units (an average of 3 m deep) built against the wall were interpreted by excavators as shops and workshops (Stern 1995d: 42). It seems likely that at least some of these structures were part of the defensive system.

We can date this construction project with some precision, thanks to four silver tetradrachms minted by Ptolemy II found in Area A1. The relationship

[9] Some artillery stones have been found in the harbor and in Area D2, overlooking it (Shatzman 1995: 59). Catapults: Murray 2012: 155–155, 158 (Table 5.2), 195 (Table 6.3), 197, 203.

between the coins and their archaeological context was only tentatively explained in publications up to this point and requires commentary and clarification here.[10] The coins were found in unit I/41 below a floor that predates the construction of the Hellenistic housing block in Area A1, which, in turn is strongly correlated according to levels and construction technique with the new city wall across the street in Area A0 (Sharon 1995: 78–79; Saragusti and Sharon 1995: 247).[11] As the façade of the housing block (W1107), city wall, and towers are contemporary constructions, they all must post-date the deposition of the coins.

The coins have the diademed portrait of Ptolemy I facing right on the obverse and the eagle facing left, standing on thunderbolt, and inscribed around ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ within a dotted border on the reverse.[12] Two were minted in Tyre, and the third is now thought to come from a Cypriot mint. The coins must date between the beginning of Ptolemy II's reign in 285 BCE and the appearance of the divine title 'Soter' on Ptolemaic issues, which first appears in 261/0 (CPE: 37–42, 92).[13] The Tyrian coins were dated by Meshorer to 279 BCE (Reg. No. 11567) and 267 BCE (Reg. No. 11566), although Catharine Lorber

[10] Discussion of the coins in Stern 1988: 13 (which = Stern 1995c: 278) is confused: "According to the stratigraphic evidence, [the Hellenistic city wall] was not erected at the very start of the Hellenistic period, since it lay over a level dating from the beginning of the period, which contained, *inter alia*, a coin of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 B.C.E.)." Although Stern mentions only one coin and does not give its registration number, and although the discussion implies that the Hellenistic city wall was built directly over the find spot of the coin, he must be referencing the coins from Area A1 discussed here.

[11] The coins were found 17.02 m above sea level, below Floor 1151 (= Floor 1152), which seems to be the topmost surface of cobble Floor 1166. The floors are assigned to Phase A1/5 and reached two walls, W1097 to the south and W1124 to the east (Sharon 1995: 70–71, 74, Photos 5.35, 5.38; 82, Plan 5.5). We cannot be certain if the coins were deposited in the floor when it was built in Phase A1/5b, or dug into an existing floor in Phase A1/5a (or even at the start of phase A1/4), but, in either scenario, they predate the construction of the Phase A1/4 Hellenistic housing block. In the final publication, the key feature in this area is the easternmost wall of the housing block ('the façade'), W1107, which is thought to be contemporary with the city wall.

[12] In the left field reverse of two coins is the club indicating the mint of Tyre; one of these also has the 'H' above (Reg. No. 11567) and another (Reg. No. 11566) has the monogram of Tyre in the same position (Svoronos: No. 637 = CPE: No. 556; Svoronos: No. 644 = CPE: No. 561). The coin now thought to be minted on Cyprus (Reg. No. 11564) has an oval (Galatian) shield in the right field and letters in the left (Svoronos: No. 538 = CPE: No. 438 and, for the shield, pages 119–120).

[13] Reg. Nos. 11564–11567, L1166, from Area A1. Many publications of Dor's coins are now out of date. Three of the coins were published (Reg. No. 11565 was apparently lost): Meshorer 1995b: 463, Pl. 8.2, Nos. 29–31; 466, Nos. 29–31 (all mistakenly labeled as coming from Area A2). Note that the coins are mislabeled in Pl. 8.2. The top row beings with No. 28 (not No. 26 as written on the plate) and ends with No. 31 (not No. 29). Note that Reg. No. 1164 (see CPE: 438) is no longer thought to be minted in Alexandria but on Cyprus. See also Saragusti and Sharon 1995: 248, Fig. 6.10, Phases 4 and 5.

says the latter probably dates to 274 BCE. Lorber associates that issue with the First Syrian War and the push to transform existing (Attic-weight) coinage into Ptolemaic currency (CPE: 115–116, 362). The Cypriot issue seems to fit the same historical context (CPE: 115, 341).

In the Area A and C report (Stern 1995a–b), excavators dated the beginning of the early Hellenistic period ('Stratum IV') conservatively to circa 275/250 BCE (Saragusti and Sharon 1995: especially 246–237, Figs. 6.8–6.9). It is more precise, if only a minor correction, to suggest that this phase began sometime between the outbreak of the First Syrian War in the mid-270s and the earliest appearance of 'Soter' on coinage in 261/0. Payment by the Ptolemaic administration to soldiers could also explain the emerging pattern of Dor's high-denomination coins,[14] most of which were issued by the first two Ptolemies. The greater number belongs to Ptolemy II. So far, all date before 261/0–including a hoard of ten tetradrachms found inside a juglet excavated in Area D1 just south of the Southwestern Wing of the Hellenistic Building Complex.[15] For a brief period in the late 3rd century, silver tetradrachms were minted at Dor (Meshorer 1995a: 355). The next tetradrachm found at the site – which is the latest pre-Roman silver coin published from Dor – was issued by the Seleukid Diodotos Tryphōn (r. 142–138) who was entrenched at Dor during the siege of 139/8 BCE until he escaped by sea (Meshorer 1995b: 464, 468, No. 63, Pl. 8.3). Further coin study might upend these observations but, for now, high denomination coinage seems to corroborate imperial activity at Hellenistic Dor known either through archaeologically attested major construction projects or historically attested events.

9.2. *Area B/3*

In a construction project related to the new Hellenistic city wall, a new gate was built in Area B (Phase 3) somewhat inside but on alignment with the earlier gate structures (**Figs. 2** and **5**; Stern 1995d: 38–40, Figs. 4.3–4.5, Plan 4.5).

[14] And large numbers of lower-denomination coins, as well, such as the group of over 40 bronzes minted at Cyprus under Ptolemy IX/Kleopatra III and Ptolemy X from Dor: Gitler and Kushnir-Stein 1994–1999: especially 48. Gitler and Kushnir-Stein believe these (and other coins found in the region) were brought all together in 103/2 BCE by Ptolemy IX when he became involved in the fighting against Alexander Jannaeus (Jos. Ant. Iud. 13.12.2).

[15] Reg. Nos. 54586/1–10, L5522; IAA Nos. 1994-48189–48198 + 1994-3505 (Stern 2000: 256–258, Figs. 178–179, where it is erroneously attributed to Area B). According to Yaakov Meshorer, six of the coins were minted by Ptolemy I and four by Ptolemy II; all but one were minted at Tyre and all are pre-reform (Stern 2000: 257). Preliminary stratigraphy by Sveta Matskevich shows that the coins were found in a fill above Phase 5 floors and below a Phase 4 wall (W5431), following the same pattern seen in Areas A1 and D2.



Fig. 5: Dor Area B showing the Hellenistic city wall and gate
(after Stern, Berg, and Sharon 1991: 52, Fig. 3. Courtesy of Tel Dor Project).

9.3. *Area D2/3–4*

Dramatic changes are evident in early Hellenistic Area D2 (tentatively assigned to Phase D2/4)[16] In this phase, Area D was dominated by two large, interconnected structures, that together we call the Hellenistic Building Complex (**Fig. 6**). We refer to these structures individually as the Main Building and the Southwestern Wing according to their relative position and internal chronology.

The plan of the Main Building is not fully understood, despite some very good preservation in a few areas. In its earlier phase (Phase D2/4), it consisted of a large room with at least two interior walls running north-south. The dimensions of the building are unknown, but the size and length of the preserved

[16] The stratigraphic sequence for the early Hellenistic period is not yet finalized for the various subdivisions of Dor Area D. For the purposes of this chapter, the early Hellenistic sequence has been tentatively assigned to Phase D2/4 to clarify its position relative to the Persian period stratigraphy discussed above. Because the early Hellenistic structures are so large, covering several sub-areas (Areas D1–D4), they will eventually have their own subphases. The Main Building is in Areas D1, D2, and D4. The Southwestern Wing is in Areas D1 and D5.

Fig. 6: The first phase of the Hellenistic Building Complex from Dor Area D, which is tentatively assigned to Phase D2/4c. At left, the Southwestern Wing; at right, the Main Building (Courtesy of Jessica Nitschke and the Tel Dor Project).

exterior walls prove that it was a considerable structure. The exterior walls are approximately 1.5 m wide, revealed over 30 m north-south (mostly in a robbing trench) and preserved over 40 m east-west. Later in the Hellenistic period (Phase D2/3), this building is remodeled. Several interior walls of the earlier phase were eliminated in favor of large piers and new, thinner (around 0.6 m) walls were added just inside and on top of the exterior ones. The relationship of these features to one another remains unclear.

As its name implies, the Southwestern Wing is located southwest of the Main Building and shares part of the latter's westernmost wall. The Southwestern Wing had four north-south rooms of about equal size and one east-west room across its entire north side, measuring altogether approximately 24 x 13 m. What happens to the Southwestern Wing relative to the reorganization of the Main Building is not known, as floors and other datable deposits were almost entirely lacking within both structures. The Southwestern Wing does undergo a serious remodeling in which the original walls are replaced with thinner ones that might be contemporary to the changes in the Main Building in Phase D2/3. The first phase (D2/4) of the Main Building can be dated precisely, however, thanks to the discovery of a pit (L05D2-548 in AN/14) sealed by the Main Building's southern wall (W17562). The pit contained Persian and early Hellenistic pottery, including a complete casserole, an unguentarium, and a Dor Type 6 lamp that dates from the mid-4th to 2nd century BCE. Crucially, it also had a bronze coin with the head of Zeus-Ammon on its obverse minted by Ptolemy II (**Fig. 7**). The

Fig. 7: The bronze coin of Ptolemy II sealed by the Hellenistic Main Building's southern wall (W17562) in Dor Area D (Courtesy of Tel Dor Project [p19Z3-1013]).

bronze coin, like the silvers mentioned above, must date before the coinage reform at the end of the 260s BCE.[17]

This southern wall and the other persevered exterior wall of the Main Building (on its western side: **Fig. 8**, left) employ a compartment-building technique in which relatively small and thin ashlars create sections ('compartments') that are then filled in with field stones and other material (Sharon 1987: 28–29, 35, 36). The technique is known earlier in Greece, Italy, and Sicily, and it is found closer by at Tyre (visible in Badre 2015: especially Fig. 9) and seemingly also at Akko (Dothan 1976: 72). Compartment style construction is further evidence of Ptolemaic involvement in this building campaign – not just through its financing, but also by supplying skilled workmen who were brought into Dor from other Ptolemaic projects (see Arbel 2011: 189–192). The compartment-building technique appears in two other areas of the *tell*, one just north of the Southwestern Wing (with as-yet no direct relationship to the Hellenistic Building Complex), and the other on the eastern side of the *tell*, Areas A–C (**Fig. 8**, right). The Southwestern Wing uses a variation on Phoenician *a-telaio* construction (what can be called pseudo-*telaio*).

The Hellenistic Building Complex is an explicit marker of change in the urban character of Dor that, like the city wall and gate in Areas A–C, appeared in the earlier Ptolemaic period.[18] Taken altogether, the exposed area of the complex measures some 800 square meters and is without obvious parallel. Dor was not

[17] Lamp: Reg. No. 05D2-1263 (unpublished; for the type, which dates from the mid-4th to 2nd centuries BCE, see Rosenthal-Heginbottom 1995: 235). Other pottery: Monnickendam-Givon 2011: Pl. 19. Coin: Reg. No. 05D2-1264, reading by Yoav Farhi: Head of Zeus-Amon facing right, Eagle standing on thunderbolt to the left, wings open. Inscription: [Π]ΤΟΛΕΜΑΙ[ΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩ[Σ]; In left field, shield with Σ above it. Two square and unclear countermarks. Minted in Egypt? Svoronos: No. 610.

[18] Another notable feature in the area dating to the 3rd century BCE is an installation for the making of purple dye, but it cannot be connected directly to the Hellenistic Building Complex (Nitschke et al. 2011: 136–137).

Fig. 8: View of compartment-built walls at Dor: left, western wall of Hellenistic Main Building in Dor Area D; right, gate and city wall in Dor Area B with some Roman pavement covering it at lower left of photograph (Courtesy of Tel Dor Project [p06D1-9658; p06B1-0099]).

a known administrative center according to extant ancient testimony, and it lacks explicit archaeological finds pointing to its function in contrast to the 40 x 56 m administrative center at Kedesh (Herbert and Berlin 2003; Berlin and Herbert 2012; Berlin and Herbert 2015: especially 429–430). Yet the size and construction of the Hellenistic Building Complex indicates that it might have served some sort of administrative function, perhaps the supervision of maritime activity.

10. Images in Early Hellenistic Dor

The role of images in everyday life of early Hellenistic Dor was reduced in comparison to the image-rich Persian period but still noteworthy. Under the first two Ptolemies, coins were very important vehicles for the spread of ideologically charged imagery in this strategic region, and Dor seems to have its share of silvers with Ptolemy and the eagle and bronzes with Zeus-Ammon (as **Fig. 7**). Figurines, though less numerous than in the preceding period, are still important. Although the corpus is not as diverse as at the one from the sanctuary site of

Fig. 9: Head of an early Hellenistic female wearing the 'melon' hairstyle from a small (7 cm tall) protome found in Dor Area B (Reg. No. 30991, W2557) (Courtesy of Tel Dor Project).

Kharayeb (Oggiano 2015), there is receptivity to a variety of types, including apparently foreign deities like Kybele (Erlich 2010: 119, 120, 168–169, Nos. 4–6). The female head shown in **Fig. 9** comes from a protome wearing the fashionable 'melon' hairstyle (Reg. No. 30991, W2557; Erlich 2010: 127, No. 42). A few of Dor's Egyptian faience amulets date to this period, as well (e.g., Herrmann 2010: 275, No. 84, Pl. 21). Lead weights with varied images – a club, a 'sign of Tanit' – and the aforementioned coins remind us that images were part of economic activities, as well (Meshorer 1995b: especially 466–468, Nos. 16–76; Stern 2000: 255).

Most image-decorated pottery of the Hellenistic period, which was always rare relative to patterned decoration, seems to date to the 2nd century BCE or later, such as handles of stamped Greek wine amphorae (Rosenthal-Heginbottom 1995: 183–204); mold-made bowls (Rosenthal-Heginbottom 1995: 209–217, 284–285; Stern 2000: 230); and braziers (cooking stands) with molded lugs (Rosenthal-Heginbottom 1995: 205–206, 283; Stern 2000: 242). Some standout works of art also date later in the Hellenistic period, such as a fine floor mosaic (Wootton 2012); a gem showing Alexander (Nitschke et al. 2011: 140, 145); and a statue of Nike (Victory). The last is probably an akroterion, hinting at the rich imagery once part of the site's monumental architecture (Stewart and Martin 2003). There is just slightly more stone sculpture in Hellenistic Dor than in the preceding period. In addition to the Nike, there is a marble herm (Stewart 1995), a small figure standing on the surface of a boat (Stewart 1995), and a few other fragments such as a marble booted foot found in Area D1 (Erlich 2010: 150–152, 205–206, here 151–152, No. 4 and 206, No. 4). But these works are late relative to the transition that interests us here, belonging to the 2nd century BCE at the earliest. In several cases, we cannot rule out a Roman date.

In sum, although the material culture of early Hellenistic Dor continued to be rich, images played less of a role in everyday life than in the Persian period. The most frequently encountered images were figurines, some of which were made 'locally', and Ptolemaic coins.

11. Conclusion: Contexts and Images in Transition

In the Persian period, Dor grew slowly under the light hands of the Sidonians and Achaemenids. In the 4th century, the mostly unfortified town seems to have enjoyed relative calm in contrast with many other parts of the Achaemenid empire where Persian forces, which in some instances included Phoenicians, often clashed with Greeks. At this time, several new military tactics and technological innovations were developed and spread into the Mediterranean among allies and foes alike (see, e.g., Diod. Sic. 13.54.6; 14.42.1–2). The choice to leave Persian Dor mostly unprotected might have been driven by a variety of factors; it was certainly unrelated to contemporary military tactics or 'global' events, however, and must instead reflect Dor's limited strategic importance.

The opposite was true in the early Hellenistic period when, two generations after the conquest of Alexander, significant imperial intervention begun under Ptolemy II remade Dor into a defensible military site. The new wall was not designed to control or protect Dor itself; rather, it was intended to ensure "the long-term security, power, and prosperity of the regime" (McNicoll and Milner 1997: 213, with respect to Successor civic initiatives). The building project was started in the later 270s or 260s BCE and finished likely well before 219 BCE. Fortification of the site had a profound and lasting effect on Dor, thrusting it into imperial disputes of the sort that had previously passed it by.

It is not easy to view the ancient built environment or material culture from the point of view of residents, yet it is evident that images were unusually prominent in the Persian period, while, in the early Hellenistic era, architecture remade life at Dor. Dor provides us with an important lesson about how we use historical epochs and political events to interpret archaeology: while architecture reveals the degree of imperial interventions in the town, the relationship between imagery and Dor's political situation is less direct and predictable, with the exception of coinage. It is under Sidonian rule when the people of Dor were exposed to the greatest variety of imagery, especially what we would recognize as Greek and Egyptian iconography. Under the Ptolemies, we see the radically reshaped Dor revert to a more familiar, limited consumption of images.

References

Arbel, Yoav, 2011, The Hasmonean Conquest of Jaffa: Chronology and New Background Evidence, in: Martin Peilstöcker and Aaron Burke (eds.), *The History and Archaeology of Jaffa* 1 (Monumenta Archaeologica 26), Los Angeles, 187–196.

Badre, Leila, 2015, A Phoenician Sanctuary in Tyre, in: Anne-Marie Maila Afeiche (ed.), *Cult and Ritual on the Levantine Coast and its Impact on the Eastern Mediterranean Realm. Proceedings of the International Symposium, Beirut 2012* (BAAL Hors-Série X), Beirut, 59–82.

Berlin, Andrea, 2019, Land/Homeland, Story/History: The Social Landscapes of the Southern Levant from Alexander to Augustus, in: Assaf Yasur-Landau, Eric Cline and Yorke Rowan (eds.), *The Social Archaeology of the Levant: From Prehistory to the Present*, Cambridge, 410–437.

Berlin, Andrea, 1997a, Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period: *Biblical Archaeologist* 60, 2–51.

Berlin, Andrea, 1997b, From Monarchy to Markets: The Phoenicians in Hellenistic Palestine: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 306, 75–88.

Berlin, Andrea and Sharon Herbert, 2012, Excavating Tel Kedesh: The Story of a Site and a Project: *Archaeology* 65 (3), 24–29.

Berlin, Andrea and Sharon Herbert, 2015, Kedesh of the Upper Galilee, in: David Fiensy and James Strange (eds.), *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods, Volume 2: The Archaeological Record from Cities, Towns, and Villages*, Minneapolis, 419–436.

Bundrick, Sheramy, 2019, *Athens, Etruria, and the Many Lives of Greek Figured Pottery* (Wisconsin Studies in Classics), Madison.

CIIP 2 = Walter Ameling, Robert Daniel, Marfa Heimbach, Dirk Kossmann, and Naomi Schneider, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae: A Multi-Lingual Corpus of the Inscriptions from Alexander to Muhammad, Volume II, Caesarea and the Middle Coast 1121-2160*, Berlin/Boston 2011.

CPE = Lorber, Catharine, *Coins of the Ptolemaic Empire. Part I, Ptolemy I through Ptolemy IV* (Numismatic Studies 32), New York 2018.

Dothan, Moshe, 1976, The Fortifications of Ptolemais: *Qadmoniot* 34/35 (2/3), 71–74 (in Hebrew).

Erlich, Adi, 2010, Figurines, Sculpture and Minor Art of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor: Figurines, Cult Objects and Amulets, 1980–2000 Seasons*, Jerusalem, 117–209.

Gibson, John, 1982, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions, Vol. III: Phoenician Inscriptions Including Inscriptions in the Mixed Dialect of Arslan Tash*, Oxford.

Gilboa, Ayelet, 2018, The Iron Age Pottery of Phases 10–5: Sequence, Contexts, Typology, Cultural Affinities, and Chronology, in: Ayelet Gilboa, Ilan Sharon, Jeffrey Zorn and Sveta Matskevich, *Excavations at Dor, Final*

Report, Volume IIB: Area G: The Late Bronze and Iron Ages: Pottery, Artifacts, Ecofacts and Other Studies (Qedem Reports 11), Jerusalem, 97–172.

Gilboa, Ayelet, Ilan Sharon, Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, and Sveta Matskevich, forthcoming, *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IV: Area B: The Bronze and Iron Ages* (provisional title), Jerusalem.

Gilboa, Ayelet, Ilan Sharon, and Yiftah Shalev, 2014, Tel Dor–2010: Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot–Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 126.

Gilboa, Ayelet, Ilan Sharon, and Jeffrey Zorn, 2014, An Iron Age I Canaanite/Phoenician Courtyard House at Tel Dor: A Comparative Architectural and Functional Analysis: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 372, 39–80.

Gitler, Haim and Alla Kushner-Stein, 1994–99, The Chronology of a Late Ptolemaic Bronze Coin-Type from Cyprus: *Israel Numismatic Journal* 13: 46–53.

Grainger, John, 1991, *Hellenistic Phoenicia*, Oxford.

Grainger, John, 2010, *The Syrian Wars* (Mnemosyne Supplements 320), Leiden/Boston.

Herbert, Sharon and Andrea Berlin, 2003, A New Administrative Center for Persian and Hellenistic Galilee: Preliminary Report of the University of Michigan/University of Minnesota Excavations at Kedesh: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 329, 13–59.

Herrmann, Christian, 2010, Egyptian Faience Amulets, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor: Figurines, Cult Objects, and Amulets, 1980–2000 Seasons*, Jerusalem, 225–276.

KAI = Donner, Herbert and Wolfgang Röllig (eds.), 1966–2002, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, 3 Vols., Wiesbaden.

Katzenstein, H. Jacob, 1979, Tyre in the Early Persian Period (539–486 B.C.E.): *Biblical Archaeologist* 42, 23–34.

Kuhrt, Amélie, 1995, *The Ancient Near East c. 3000–330 BC*, London.

Lehmann, Gunnar, Yiftah Shalev, Hans Mommsen, David Ben-Shlomo, Małgorzata Daszkiewicz, Gerwulf Schneider, and Ayelet Gilboa, 2019, The Kelenderis Pottery Workshop(s): Newly Identified Agents in East Mediterranean Maritime Exchange Networks in the Achaemenid Period: *Levant* 51 (3), 287–313.

Markoe, Glenn, 2000, *Phoenicians* (Peoples of the Past), London.

Martin, S. Rebecca, 2007, *'Hellenization' and Southern Phoenicia: Reconsidering the Impact of Greece Before Alexander* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley), Berkeley.

Martin, S. Rebecca, 2014a, 'East Greek' and Greek Imported Pottery of the First Millennium B.C.E., in: David Ben-Shlomo and Gus Van Beek (eds.), *The Smithsonian Institution Excavation at Tell Jemmeh, Israel 1970–1990*

(Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology 50), Washington, D.C., 749–775.

Martin, S. Rebecca, 2014b, From the East to Greece and Back Again: Terracotta Gorgon Masks in a Phoenician Context, in: André Lemaire with Bertrand Dufour and Fabian Pfitzmann (eds.), *Phéniciens d'Orient et d'Occident: Mélanges Josette Élayi*, Vol. 2, Paris, 289–299.

Martin, S. Rebecca, 2017, *The Art of Contact: Comparative Approaches to Greek and Phoenician Art*, Philadelphia.

Martin, S. Rebecca and Yiftah Shalev, 2022, The Reoccupation of Southern Phoenicia in the Persian Period: Rethinking the Evidence, in: Uri Davidovich, Naama Yahalom-Mack and Sveta Matskevich (eds.), *Material, Method, and Meaning. Papers in Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology in honor of Ilan Sharon* (Ägypten und Altes Testament 110), Münster, 101–116.

Matskevich, Sveta, Ayelet Gilboa, and Ilan Sharon, 2014, Tel Dor–2011: Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot–Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 126.

McNicoll, Anthony and N. P. Milner, 1997, *Hellenistic Fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates* (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology), Oxford.

Meyers, Eric and Mark Chancey, 2014, *Alexander to Constantine: Archaeology of the Land of the Bible*, Vol. 3, New Haven.

Meshorer, Yaʿakov, 1995a, The Coins of the Mint of Dora, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IA: Areas A and C: Introduction and Stratigraphy* (Qedem Reports 1), Jerusalem, 355–365.

Meshorer, Yaʿakov, 1995b, Coins from Areas A and C, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IB: Areas A and C: The Finds* (Qedem Reports 2), Jerusalem, 461–472.

Millar, Fergus, 1983, The Phoenician Cities: A Case-Study of Hellenisation: *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 209, 55–71.

Monnickendam-Givon, Barak, 2011, Plain Ware of the Southern Carmel Coast During the Late Persian to Hellenistic Periods, M.A. thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem (in Hebrew).

Murray, William M., 2012, *The Age of Titans: The Rise and Fall of the Great Hellenistic Navies* (Onassis Series in Hellenic Culture), New York.

Nitschke, Jessica, S. Rebecca Martin, and Yiftah Shalev, 2011, Between Carmel and the Sea, Tel Dor: The Late Periods: *Near Eastern Archaeology* 74 (3), 132–154.

Nunn, Astrid, 2000, *Der figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordaniens vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, Series Archaeologica 18), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Nunn, Astrid, 2014, Attic Pottery Imports and Their Impact on 'Identity Discourses': A Reassessment, in: Christian Frevel, Katharina Pyschny, and Izak Cornelius (eds.), *A 'Religious Revolution' in Yehûd? The Material*

Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 267), Fribourg, 391–429.

Oggiano, Ida, 2015, The Question of 'Plasticity' of Ethnic and Cultural Identity: The Case Study of Kharayeb, in: Anne-Marie Maïla-Afeiche (ed.), *Cult and Ritual on the Levantine Coast and its Impact on the Eastern Mediterranean Realm* (Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL Hors-Série 10), Beirut, 507–528.

Rosenthal-Heginbottom, Renate, 1995, Imported Hellenistic and Roman Pottery, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IB: Areas A and C: The Finds* (Qedem Reports 2), Jerusalem, 183–288.

Saragusti, Idit and Ilan Sharon, 1995, Collation of Absolute Dates for the Persian-Roman Phases in Areas A and C, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IA: Areas A and C: Introduction and Stratigraphy* (Qedem Reports 1), Jerusalem, 235–249.

Shalev, Yiftah, 2009, Tel Dor and the Urbanization of the Coastal Plain of Israel During the Persian Period: *Eretz Israel* 29, 363–371 (Hebrew).

Shalev, Yiftah, 2014, *"The Mighty Grain-Lands": Demographic and Commercial Aspects of 'Southern Phoenicia' under the Achaemenid Regime* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Haifa), Haifa (in Hebrew).

Shalev, Yiftah and S. Rebecca Martin, 2012, Crisis as Opportunity: Phoenician Urban Renewal after the Babylonians: *Transeuphratène* 41, 81–100.

Sharon, Ilan, 1991, The Fortifications of Dor and the Transition from the Israeli-Syrian Concept of Defence to the Greek Concept: *Qadmoniot* 24, 105–113 (in Hebrew).

Sharon, Ilan, 1995, The Stratigraphy of Areas A and C, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IA: Areas A and C: Introduction and Stratigraphy* (Qedem Reports 1), Jerusalem, 49–234.

Sharon, Ilan, Ayelet Gilboa, and Avshalom Karasik, 2006, Tel Dor–2004: Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot–Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 118.

Sharon, Ilan, Ayelet Gilboa, and Yiftah Shalev, 2009a, Tel Dor–2005: Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot–Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 121.

Sharon, Ilan, Ayelet Gilboa, and Yiftah Shalev, 2009b, Tel Dor–2006: Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot–Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 121.

Sharon, Ilan, Ayelet Gilboa, and Yiftah Shalev, 2010, Tel Dor–2007, 2008: Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot–Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 122.

Sharon, Ilan, Ayelet Gilboa, and Yiftah Shalev, 2011, Tel Dor–2009: Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot–Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 123.

Sharon, Ilan, Ayelet Gilboa, Andrew Stewart, and Elisabeth (sic) Bloch-Smith, 2009, Tel Dor–2000, 2002, 2003: Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot–Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 121.

Shatzman, Israel, 1995, Stone-Balls from Tel Dor and the Artillery of the Hellenistic World: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 14, 52–72.

Shatzman, Israel, 1991, Ballista Stones from Tel Dor and the Artillery of the Greco-Roman World: *Qadmoniot* 23, 94–104 (in Hebrew).
Shefton, Brian, 2000, Reflections on the Presence of Attic Pottery at the Eastern End of the Mediterranean During the Persian Period: *Transeuphratène* 19, 75–82.
Steiner, Margreet and Ann Killebrew (eds.), 2014, *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant: c. 8000–332 BCE*, Oxford.
Stern, Ephraim, 1980, Tel Dor, 1980 (Notes and News): *Israel Exploration Journal* 30 (3/4), 209–213.
Stern, Ephraim, 1982a, Excavations at Tel Dor, 1981: Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 32 (2/3), 107–117.
Stern, Ephraim, 1982b, A Favissa of a Phoenician Sanctuary from Tel Dor: *Journal of Jewish Studies: Essays in Honor of Yigael Yadin* 33 (1), 35–54.
Stern, Ephraim, 1983, Tel Dor, 1983 (Notes and News): *Israel Exploration Journal* 33 (3/4), 259–261.
Stern, Ephraim, 1985, Tel Dor, 1984 (Notes and News): *Israel Exploration Journal* 35, 60–64.
Stern, Ephraim, 1988, The Walls of Dor: *Israel Exploration Journal* 38, 6–14.
Stern, Ephraim, 1994, A Phoenician-Cypriote Votive Scapula from Tel Dor: A Maritime Scene: *Israel Exploration Journal* 44, 1–12.
Stern, Ephraim, 1995a, *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IA: Areas A and C: Introduction and Stratigraphy* (Qedem Reports 1), Jerusalem.
Stern, Ephraim, 1995b, *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IB: Areas A and C: The Finds* (Qedem Reports 2), Jerusalem.
Stern, Ephraim, 1995c, Historical Conclusions, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report*, *Volume IA: Areas A and C: Introduction and Stratigraphy* (Qedem Reports 1), Jerusalem, 271–283.
Stern, Ephraim, 1995d, Stratigraphical Summary of Architectural Remains, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IA: Areas A and C: Introduction and Stratigraphy* (Qedem Reports 1), Jerusalem, 29–48.
Stern, Ephraim, 2000, *Dor, Ruler of the Seas: Nineteen Years of Excavations at the Israelite-Phoenician Harbor Town on the Carmel Coast*, Jerusalem.
Stern, Ephraim, 2001, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible. Volume II: The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods, 732–332 BCE*, New York.
Stern, Ephraim, 2010, Figurines and Cult Objects of the Iron Age and Persian Period, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor: Figurines, Cult Objects, and Amulets, 1980–2000 Seasons*, Jerusalem, 3–113.
Stern, Ephraim, John Berg, Ayelet Gilboa, Ilan Sharon, and Jeffrey Zorn, 1997, Tel Dor, 1994–1995: Preliminary Stratigraphic Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 47 (1/2), 29–56.
Stern, Ephraim, John Berg, and Ilan Sharon, 1991, Tel Dor, 1988–1989: Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 41 (1/3), 46–61.
Stern, Ephraim, Ayelet Gilboa, and Ilan Sharon, 1989, Tel Dor, 1987: Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 39 (1/2), 32–42.

Stern, Ephraim, Ayelet Gilboa, and Ilan Sharon, 1992, Tel Dor, 1991: Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 42 (1/2), 34–46.

Stern, Ephraim, Ayelet Gilboa, and Ilan Sharon, 2000, Tel Dor–1996: *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 20, 30*–33*, 44–47.

Stern, Ephraim, Ayelet Gilboa, Ilan Sharon, John Berg, Jeffrey Zorn, Rainer Mack, Benny Har-Even, Nati Kranot, and Svetlana Tzivolsky, 2000, Tel Dor–1997–1998: *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 110: *23–*30.

Stern, Ephraim and Ilan Sharon, 1983, Tel Dor, 1982 (Notes and News): *Israel Exploration Journal* 33 (1/2), 117–119.

Stern, Ephraim and Ilan Sharon, 1986, Tel Dor, 1985 (Notes and News): *Israel Exploration Journal* 36 (1/2), 101–104.

Stern, Ephraim and Ilan Sharon, 1987, Tel Dor, 1986: Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 37 (4), 201–211.

Stern, Ephraim and Ilan Sharon, 1993, Tel Dor, 1992: Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 43 (2/3): 126–150.

Stern, Ephraim and Ilan Sharon, 1995, Tel Dor, 1993: Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 45 (1): 26–36.

Stern, Ephraim, Ilan Sharon, Shira Buchwald, Benny Har-Even, Nati Kranot, and Ayelet Gilboa, 2000, Tel Dor–1999, *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 112: 29*–33*, 34–38.

Stewart, Andrew, 1995, Marble Sculpture, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Volume IB: Areas A and C: The Finds* (Qedem Reports 2), Jerusalem, 457–459.

Stewart, Andrew and S. Rebecca Martin, 2003, Hellenistic Discoveries at Tel Dor (Israel): *Hesperia* 72 (2), 121–145.

Stewart, Andrew and S. Rebecca Martin, 2005, Attic Imported Pottery at Tel Dor, Israel: An Overview: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 337, 79–94.

Stucky, Rolf, 1993, *Die Skulpturen aus dem Eschmun-Heiligtum bei Sidon: Griechische, römische, kyprische und phönizische Statuen und Reliefs vom 6. Jahrhundert vor Chr. bis zum 3. Jahrhundert nach Chr*., Basel.

Svoronos, Ioannes, 1904–08, *Ta Nomismata tou kratous ton Ptolemaion*, Athens (in Greek).

Tal, Oren, 2005, Some Remarks on the Coastal Plain of Palestine under Achaemenid Rule – An Archaeological Synopsis, in: Pierre Briant and Rémy Boucharlat (eds.), *L'archéologie de l'empire achéménide, nouvelles recherches: Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France par le 'Réseau international d'études et de recherches achéménides,' GDR 2538 CNRS, 21–22 novembre 2003* (Persika 6), Paris, 71–96.

Tal, Oren, 2006, *The Archaeology of Hellenistic Palestine: Between Tradition and Renewal*, Jerusalem (in Hebrew).

Tel Dor Excavation Project Official Website, http://dor.huji.ac.il/.

Wootton, Will, 2012, Making and Meaning: The Hellenistic Mosaic from Tel Dor: *American Journal of Archaeology* 116 (2), 209–234.

WERE COLUMBARIA USED IN JUDAH DURING THE LATE IRON AGE?

Dalit Regev

An excavation in a farmstead near Jerusalem exposed several underground installations, of which the most noteworthy is a columbarium dated to the late Iron Age. While columbaria are traditionally dated in the Southern Levant to the Hellenistic period, a few columbaria excavated in the Jerusalem area have unearthed much earlier evidence. How old is the columbaria phenomenon in the Ancient Near East, and should it still be dated to the Hellenistic period?

1. Introduction

The excavated site at El-ʿAzariya is located on the eastern slope of Mount Scopus, 1.75 km east of ancient Jerusalem (map ref. NIG 224062/630806) (**Fig. 1**).[1] El-ʿAzariya was identified as the Jewish village Beit ʿAniya known from the Second Temple Period and mentioned by John 11:18 (Zissu 2001: 97–98). The excavations revealed underground installations that assumingly served a farmstead built above which has not survived due to intense building activity in the modern neighborhood. The underground level of the farmstead was used for a variety of functions including storage, pigeon growing, domestic industry and stock shelter, cooking, and bathing. The farm was constructed in the Iron Age II and was used throughout the Persian, Hellenistic, and Early Roman periods (**Figs. 2 & 3**). Like all underground installations that were utilized over long periods of time it is hard to determine with certainty when they were first constructed. Spoilage and intrusions from upper levels of all dates can affect the stratigraphy and dating of such installations. The suggested date of the first stage of the El-ʿAzariya is therefore a proposal. It cannot be proven beyond doubt that the installation is dated to the Iron Age, nor that it functioned as a columbarium. However, the possibility cannot be overlooked and merits attention.

The farmsteads of the hill and mountain area were small settlements built in two levels: an upper residential level that consists of one or more units made of several rooms and a court, and a lower underground level dug into the lime rock

[1] The excavation was conducted in 2009 by L. Shapira on behalf of ADCA-IAA with the help of S. Amami (photography), F. Portnov (measures), and M. Manukian, A. Ruban, and A. Harel (drawings). Partial preliminary results have been published in Hebrew, Regev, and Shapira 2013.



Fig. 1: Location of El-'Azariya.



Fig. 2: The five phases of the underground level of the farmstead at El-'Azariya.

that served as the industrial area of the household. The lower level could include any, or all, of the following installations: storage area, oil press, columbarium, water cistern, ritual bath (*miqveh*), and other workspaces like a weaving area and kitchen. These are mainly domestic non-specialized endeavors that manufactured various products, based on the available agricultural crops of the area and the family's assets and skills.

The same occupation pattern of above and below ground levels is found along the mountain and hill area from Jenin at the northern edge of Samaria area (biblical ʿEn Gannim, later known as Ganim, also mentioned by Josephus in Jos. Bell. Jud. 3.48), to Hebron, Maʿon and Eshtemoa in southern Judea, from the Iron Age to the Hellenistic and early Roman periods (8th century BCE to 1st century CE). This is the agricultural and industrial country area that served mainly the cities of Jerusalem, Samaria, Shechem and Hebron, but also provided for the coastal area on one side and the Jordan valley on the other side mainly with olive oil.

The site is situated in a farmland region and is part of a belt of agricultural sites that surrounded Jerusalem. Its urban center is dating to the Middle Bronze Age II. These agricultural settlements disappeared during the Late Bronze Age, reappeared in the Iron Age I and reached a peak during the Iron Age II, during the First Temple Period when Jerusalem was the capital of Judea. During the 8th and 7th centuries BCE hundreds of settlements surrounded the city, most of them were farmsteads; this is clearly the result of extensive growth of Jerusalem during this time and the need to feed its inhabitants and visitors. Many of the Iron Age II sites were founded in the 7th century BCE, like the earliest phase of our site, and large parts of them were populated by refugees that fled the Assyrian destruction of Samaria and the Israelite kingdom in 722 BCE. The size and number of settlements of this belt was reduced considerably during the Babylonian and Persian periods and resumed only during the Hellenistic period in the 3rd century, but mainly from the 2nd century BCE onwards (Baruch 1998: 54; Faust 2007: 165–172). These settlements were deserted or destroyed at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. The site, like most Jewish sites around Jerusalem and in Judea, was abandoned either in 70 CE, the years after, or in 132–135 CE. Starting in the Byzantine period the same area was part of the monasteries belt that wrapped Jerusalem from the east, although no finds of this period have been found in our excavation.

The farm strip that provided agricultural products to Jerusalem extended 4 to 6 km from the city, but other, bigger villages provided the city with tools, vessels, and products. Many of these sites operated winepresses and ritual baths; some maintained olive presses and some columbaria (Baruch 1998; Amit 2007: 152).



Fig. 3: The sections of the underground level at El-'Azariya.

The study of this corpus adds important data to the unfolding picture of settlement continuity in the hill and mountain rural areas of the Iron Age kingdoms of Israel and Judea, from the late Iron Age to the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. Examples of such continuity are found at excavated sites like Ḥorvat ʿAli, on the main road from Jerusalem to Samaria (Itach, Regev, and Hizmi 2018), Jubara, located 16 km east of Samaria (Regev and Greenfeld, in preparation) and this site east of Jerusalem (Regev and Shapira 2013).

Other examples in the Jerusalem area for settlement continuity can be found at Qalandiya, 8–9 km north of Jerusalem, operated during the same time span as our farm cave, from the late Iron II period until 70 CE (Magen 2004). At Rogem Gannim, 5 km west of ancient Jerusalem, another farm with several winepresses, a ritual bath and storage caves functioned during the Iron Age II, the Persian period, the early Roman period and again during the early Islamic period (Greenberg and Cinamon 2011: 79–106). A farmhouse on the eastern slopes of Mount Scopus, ca. 4 km north of Jerusalem, was also founded during the late Iron II period, operated a winepress until the destruction of the city in the 7th century BCE and was refunded, with a columbarium, during the Herodian period (Mazor 2006). A dwelling cave in Jerusalem, area used from the Iron Age to the Persian period, was found near the Holyland Buildings in western Jerusalem (Ben-Arieh 2000). Farmsteads with caves used for storage of animals and equipment, dated to the late Hellenistic and early Roman period, were excavated on Mount of Olives and Ras Abu Maʿaruf (Pisgat Ze'ev) east of Jerusalem (Seligman 1999; Seligman and Raya 2000; Seligman 2009).

2. The First Stage of Use – an Iron Age Columbarium?

Located at the western part, a deep four-armed installation is the largest facility of the site complex (**Figs. 4–6**).[2] Cut in the stone with plastered floor, it is 6.4 m deep, 16 m long and 11.7 m wide. A rectangular entrance (2 x 0.8 m) from the south end leads down from the surface, with at least twelve steps, to the bottom floor. A square opening (1.6 x 1.6 m) is located at the ceiling in the middle of the installation. Although the eastern and western parts of this area were blocked during later phases and used for different purposes, the original shape of the area is visible at its ceiling, which was cut in the rock with four arms. The western part of the installation was later used as a water cistern and the eastern part is the oil press' northern part. The oil press is thus later than the installation, and so is

[2] Loci 109, 115, 121, 127, 129, 130, 132, 136, 137, floor 139, 141, 143, 144, 145, floor 146, 147.

Fig. 4: View from above at the main entrance.

Fig. 5: View from inside towards the entrance.



Fig. 6: Plan of the installation with loci numbers.

the water cistern. This structure went out of use when its two wings were converted into different functions; the central part was then used for storage, as revealed by the finds. Based on many of the finds in this area the change infunction may have occurred sometime during the 2nd or 1st century BCE, when the small columbarium was built.

This area was the first part hewn and occupied in the underground level. It was here where a critical amount of the Iron Age II and Persian period pottery was found at the site and only up to 5% of the later material. In addition, the floor finds of the oil press, which occupies a later phase of one arm of the installation, were dated to the Iron Age and Persian period alone. These finds point to a date in the late Iron Age for the original installation rather than to the Persian or the Hellenistic period. In conclusion, a dating to the 7th or the early 6th century BCE provides the best explanation for the site stratigraphy as well as for the distribution of pottery.

The walls of the installation that have been exposed reach 3.2 m high from the floor. At this height, the wall creates a step of half a meter wide on both sides and continues upwards, but the upper part is missing and thus no niches were found.

Similar installations dated to the Iron Age II were found at Beth-Shemesh, Beersheba and Amman (Tsuk 2000: 144–151, figs. 201–204, 18–22). Although the Beth-Shemesh and Beersheba installations were identified as water reservoirs, this is not the case here, if only for the shelves up the walls that appear only in columbaria, not in water installations (Herzog and Singer-Avitz 2016: 445–476, figs. 9.24–9.25). In addition, large water installations make sense in a city like Beersheba, but not in the suburbs of Jerusalem in the rural area. Similar in construction is a six-armed columbarium of the Hellenistic period at Maresha. The walls beneath the niches in the columbaria there go up between 2.2 and 4.3 m in a 6.6 m high structure (like our structure where they reach 6.4 m), and 2.7 m in a lower structure. In both cases the height of the installation and the height of the step that marks the beginning of niches for doves is closely comparable. The similarity of height measurements between the installation at the El-ʿAzariya and Maresha columbarium is indicating that our structure might have been a columbarium as well, while only the walls beneath the niches have survived.

3. Finds

The corpus of finds at the site span from the Iron Age to the Roman period. The oil lamps are of types dated from the Persian period to the early Roman period. Besides pottery, the finds also include beads made of shell, faience, glass and carnelian, bone spatula, large amount of stone vessels and objects, loom weights and spindle whorls, metal objects and a glass bottle. Also found were two stamped jar handles of the 2nd century BCE of types common in Jerusalem (*YRŠLM* and *YHD*), and ten unidentifiable coins, most of which come from a surface context. Only finds from the Iron Age are presented here to support the suggestion that the earlier phase should be dated to that period.

3.1. *Jars (**Pl. 1: 1–5** and **Tab. 1: 1–5**)*

The 15 Iron Age jars found in the excavation are mostly of one type, the hole-mouth jars typical of the Iron Age II, but one item is of a different type, dated to the Iron Age I.

- Type 1 – jar of ovoid body, short neck, two handles on shoulders: Punctured handles with one to 28 punctured dots are common in the mountain areas of Samaria and Judea between the 12th and 10th centuries BCE. Punctured handles of this type appear on jugs and jars and probably do not have any specific function rather than for decoration (Finkelstein, Bunimovitz, and Lederman 1993: 162). At El-ʿAzariya the one handle found of this type seems to be the only Iron I sherd retrieved from the excavation. Found in the oil press area the handle is probably intrusive, but this type continues into the Iron Age II, although probably not as late as the 8th and 7th centuries BCE, which is the date for the Iron Age pottery at the site.
- Type 2 – Hole-mouth jar: Hole-mouth jars of various rims and shoulders are typical of the Iron Age II, especially in Judea and the Negev. These small cylindrical vessels first appear at the end of the 10th or end of the 9th century and continue to the early 6th century, but are most common during the 8th and 7th centuries BCE (Mazar, Kelm, and Panitz-Cohen 2001: 107; Barkay, Fantalkin, and Tal 2002: 61, 68). All the hole-moth jars found at our site are of a similar type with rounded rim and flat to rounded shoulders, with parallels dating to the 8th to 6th centuries BCE. This is also the jar type found at the rounded columbarium at ʿAin al-Baida in Amman dated to the Iron Age period (Khairy and Kakish 2013).

3.2. *Cooking Pots (**Pl. 1: 6–8** and **Tab. 1: 6–8**)*

Three types of cooking pots were found in the Iron Age corpus, but the overall percentage of cooking pots during the Iron Age is smaller than in later periods. Type 1 is the most common type of the late Iron Age II. This may be Beth-Shean type CP56 which is the most common cooking pot in Judea and Israel sites during the 8th century BCE (Mazar 2006: 342–345). Similar cooking pots are dated at Gezer to the mid-9th to mid-8th century, at Moẓa from mid-9th to mid-7th century, at Tell el-Farʿah (North) to the 8th century and at Samaria to 8th to early 6th century BCE.

- Type 1 – neckless cooking pot with wide opening and thick rounded ridged rim. One such item was found on the oil press floor, references are dated to the 9th–8th centuries BCE.
- Type 2 – globular cooking pot with flaring neck. References are dated to the 9th–7th centuries BCE.
- Type 3 – cooking jug with globular body, narrow neck and one handle are common in Judea in the Iron Age II period.

3.3. *Bowls (**Pl. 1: 9–28** and **Tab. 1: 9–28**)*

The bowls found in the Iron Age corpus represent a large variety of forms and types. 12 items are of the large heavy types, some of which are close to krater forms, and 20 items are of the smaller thinner types.

- Type 1 – large flaring bowl with handles from thickened rim, red burnished.
- Type 2 – large plate with heavy sharp rim. References are dated to the 10th–8th centuries BCE.
- Type 3 – large bowl with thick rim, burnished or smoothed on the interior. This type is common in northern Israel from the late 9th to the 8th century BCE.
- Type 4 – incurved rim heavy bowl with thickened projecting rim. References are dated to the 10th–7th/6th centuries BCE.
- Type 5 – heavy bowls with straight walls and thickened rim. References are dated to the 10th–7th/6th centuries BCE.
- Type 6 – hemispheric bowls with everted rim. References are dated to the end of the 8th to the 6th century BCE.
- Type 7 – hemispheric bowls with rounded simple rim. References are dated to the 7th–6th centuries BCE.
- Type 8 – red-slipped bowls with thickened projecting rim. References are dated to the 9th–7th centuries BCE.

3.4. *Iron Age Pottery: Summary and Conclusions*

The pottery corpus of the Iron Age period includes mainly hole-moth jars and bowls but also cooking pots and a basin (**Graph 1**). The bowls represent 60% of it, 38% of which are decorated and fine ware and 22% are coarse heavy bowls. The hole-mouth jars represent 32% of the Iron Age pottery. Over 50% of the Iron Age pottery comes from the installation, and 18% comes from the oil press area, located on the eastern wing of this structure, including from floor context. All in all, about 75% of the Iron Age pottery comes from this area. These finds indicate that the installation was made and starting used in the Iron Age II, probably at the end of the 8th or in the 7th century BCE, as indicated by the date of the types found. Some of the types are dated between the 10th and 6th centuries BCE, i.e., along the entire Iron Age II, but some are dated from the end of the 8th into early 6th centuries BCE. Our Iron Age pottery corpus, therefore, excluding the single Iron Age I sherd, should be dated not earlier than the late 8th century BCE; this date also applies to the hole-mouth jars.



Graph 1: Frequency of Iron Age pottery vessels.

4. Discussion

Farmsteads and small villages were scattered around Jerusalem starting in the Middle Bronze Age. Their number increased in the Iron Age II and continued to exist throughout the Persian, Hellenistic, and the early Roman period until the devastation of Judea by the Roman army in two waves in the 1st and the 2nd century CE.

The underground farmstead at El-ʿAzariya, as similar type farmstead sites, shows a comparable segmentation between storage, cooking and table ware, between the Iron Age II and the Persian and Hellenistic period. While bowls are properly present in Iron Age corpora, they are neglected in Persian, Hellenistic, and early Roman periods. Based on the finds it seems that during the Iron Age II the underground space was used mainly for storage, food processing, animals' shelter, but also for human habitation. Possibly, it may also have been used for pigeon farming. During the Persian period underground oil presses and other industrial activities were common and this pattern increased in the subsequent Hellenistic period. By the late Hellenistic period Jewish ritual baths appeared in the underground complexes of farmsteads and villages. The lack of tableware between the Persian and early Roman periods seems to indicate that these underground spaces were largely restricted to the production and storage of various agricultural activities.

In addition to the above excavation, other installations have been excavated in the past in the vicinity of our site, including a columbarium and three ritual baths. These finds indicate a residential site above the underground remains, and the presence of more than one farmstead in this area, probably a village made of several units, like the one at Jubara (Regev and Greenfeld, in preparation).

The Iron Age pottery corpus of our site parallels mainly those found in Jerusalem and its surroundings but also in many of the inland sites of the Southern Levant. Rarely found in coastal sites, the Iron Age II types of this corpus are more common in mountain and hill sites from the northern Samaria area to the northern Negev. This geographical area was inhabited during the Iron Age II mainly by the peoples of the kingdoms of Judea and Israel. Judging by the continuity of occupancy in our site, as in other farmsteads in the mountain and hill areas, it seems that, at least in rural settlements, the local population continued from the Iron Age into the Roman period without breaks.

Based on the distribution of the Iron Age II pottery at the site and the architecture of the installation – with its high smoothed walls, a shelf at mid-height and an opening in the mid ceiling – it is suggested here that this installation was used as a columbarium.

Columbaria, built and hewn installations for pigeon farming, are known in the Southern Levant from the Hellenistic period onwards. Currently, such rock-cut installations can be dated to the Hellenistic period and built installations are dated from the late Hellenistic to Byzantine and early Muslim periods. Columbaria of the hewn type are mainly found in the Judean hills area (Maresha region) and built columbaria towers of the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods were found in Jerusalem, Jericho, Masada, Herodion and Ḥorvat Abu Haf in the Negev (Zissu 1995). Built columbaria towers of the Byzantine and early Muslim periods were found in the Negev (Shivta and ʿAmra) and the Hebron Mountains (Yattir). Other examples combine the use of hewn columbaria with built columbaria; a few cases dated to the Roman period were reported from the western Samaria hills (Ẓur Natan) and the eastern part of Hebron Mountains (Khirbet Aristobulia and Khirbet Rabiʿa) (Batz 2006).

Nonetheless, the division between hewn and built columbaria may not be chronological but rather regional, based on the stone morphology of the area. The Judean hills are made up of soft limestone, requiring little effort to excavate and therefore present men-made installations more than in other areas in Judea and Samaria with different stone types.

Three columbaria, one west of Jerusalem (Givat Shaul), one southeast of the city (Har Ḥoma) and one at the Judean hills area (Aderet), can be dated to the Iron Age II based on pottery. At least one of these, at Givʿat Shaul, combines the use of hewn columbaria with built walls. Other hewn columbaria, one is also four-armed and features Iron Age II pottery, has been excavated at Ḥorvat Ḥazzan in the Judean hills area (Peretz and Talis 2012; Zilberbod 2015; Ein Mor 2019). These installations may be part of an emerging phenomenon pointing at Iron Age II columbaria in Judea (**Fig. 7**). Another hewn rounded columbarium has been excavated in Amman, where one single type of pottery was found, jars dating from the late 8th to the early 6th centuries, thus representing Iron Age ware

too. Other columbaria in Jordan like those found at ʿIraq el-Emir, Muʿallaqat al-Dayr, Muqablein/ʿAmman, el-ʿUmeiri, and at Wadi Shuʿayb may also be perhaps redated to the late Iron Age (Kakish 2012).

A rounded built columbarium found in the Bethel mountain area was dated to the early Roman period (Aharonovich 2019). However, it is possible to date built columbaria earlier: a similar circular structure in ʿAtlit at the coast was dated to the 5th–4th centuries BCE (Sari 2010) (**Fig. 8**). The dating is based on the pottery evidence from the installation and the floor above it. This early date can be paralleled with at least one of the Iron Age columbaria in the Jerusalem area that showed combined rock-cutting and building techniques. Built columbaria thus may already have existed during the Persian period. Five other rounded built columbaria at Karanis in Egypt are dated also to the Hellenistic period. They were destroyed in the 2nd century BCE (Ziffer 1998: 27). Evidently, the introduction of built columbaria towers can be dated no later than the Hellenistic period.

Raising pigeons for agricultural and cult purposes, but also for using them as message carriers, begins much earlier than in the Hellenistic period. Models of dove-towers are commonly found in Mesopotamia, the Levant and Cyprus starting in the 3rd millennium BCE (Ziffer 1998: 35). These models were interpreted in the past as cult-stands or incense burners (*thymiateria*) but are now recognized as models of contemporary buildings and installations that served as votives in temples and sanctuaries.

One such example which clearly demonstrates the existence of built columbaria during the late Iron Age is a clay model dated to the 6th century BCE from Idalion in Cyprus that shows dancers surrounding a tower with windows and doves at its top. The tower is higher than the dancers and thus indicates that this is indeed a model of larger building and not a cult stand. Other clay models of dove towers/columbaria are dated already to the 2nd millennium BCE. One of them was found at Beth-Shemesh in the Judean hills area and belongs to the 11th century BCE (Ziffer 1998: 35–38, 67–68, figs. 43, 87).

At Tell Afis in Syria, glazed clay funnels were found near Temple AI's outside wall. These cylindrical objects may have been placed originally on the highest part of the wall and may have been used as dovecotes. The large amount of dove bones found around the temple and the literary evidence from Emar and Ugarit referring to sacrificial birds, including doves (for example VI.3.452, KTU 1.41 and KTU 1.87), indicates that dove raising was likely already practiced in the Late Bronze Age at Afis (Minunno 2013: 26–30, 71–85). In addition, the biblical mention of doves sacrifice (Lev 17:13), may also point at a dovecote (i.e., columbarium) in the Iron Age temple at Tell Afis (Carenti and Minunno 2013; Soldi 2019).



Fig. 7: Iron Age II columbaria in Judea.



Fig. 8: Rounded built columbaria.

Doves were also worshiped in temples as a representation of divinities, especially Astarte/Ishtar (Sugimoto 2014: 23, 30, 91). Vessels decorated with doves were found in MB II *favissa* in Ishtar cult area and in palatial contexts at Ebla. These vessels were interpreted as cultic objects associated with the goddess. In

Mari, a dove is depicted in wall paintings above a palm tree, which is a symbol of Ishtar. In a literary evidence from Ugarit (RS 24.252), the goddess Anat can take the form of a dove and fly to Baʿal to announce the birth of his son or completion of his palace, and in the Assyrian tablets from Sultantepe (the *Birdcall Text*, KAR 125.13) a dove is the bird of Tammuz (Lambert 1970; Weinfeld 1991; Pinnock 2014).

Model shrines of the Late Bronze and Iron Ages often include doves at the top of the temple, above the goddess image (Kletter, Ziffer, and Zwickel 2015: 44, Fig. 4.53). There is clear indication for doves associated with cult and worship in the Ancient Near East from the Middle Bronze throughout the Iron Age and one can assume, therefore, the need for dovecotes in the Iron Age. This is true also for the period from the Iron Age to the early Roman period in Judea, especially around Jerusalem and its temple.

The raising of pigeons was common in the Judean hills area with the practice becoming more popular in the 1st century CE (Safrai 2010: 257–258). Nonetheless, the farm strip around Jerusalem contained many columbaria of earlier dates, probably used to raise doves for ritual purposes at the Temple in Jerusalem (Baruch 1998: 47–50; Ziffer 1998: 95–97). Currently, finds of late Hellenistic and early Roman period columbaria near and inside ancient Jerusalem amount to over forty. Among these are columbaria found in the farmstead belt around Jerusalem, for example at several locations in Ras Abu Maʿaruf (Pisgat Ze'ev) on the north, alongside ritual baths and oil presses (Greenhut 1997: 147; Seligman 2006: 5–8), and near our site at Ras esh-Sheikh ʿAnbar and at the French Hill site east of Mount Scopus (Mazor 1996: 2006). Other columbaria have been found in earlier excavations at El-ʿAzariya/Abu Dis (Zissu 2001: 97–98). More examples were found close to the city walls, like the one at Shemuel Hanavi St., found near an early Roman Jewish tomb west of the city walls (Rahmani 1982), and few were found at the City of David (Zissu 2009). The phenomenon of columbaria affinity to a temple or cult site is true not only for Jerusalem. It has been offered as an explanation for the presence of columbaria at Petra and ʿIraq el-Emir, associated with cult sites in their area like the temple of Qasr el-Bint (Kakish 2012: 188).

Our rock-cut installation may thus be another example of early hewn columbaria dated to the 7th century BCE. As this shape is quite unique and both the examples from El-ʿAzariya and Ḥorvat Ḥazzan can be dated to the 7th century BCE, the known six-armed columbarium at Maresha could belong to a much earlier date as well (**Fig. 9**). As Maresha revealed large amounts of Persian period pottery the six-armed columbarium there may be dated to this period, but an earlier date is also possible.



Fig. 9: Plan of the columbarium at Maresha.



Pl. 1: Iron Age pottery found at the installation.

#	Loc.	Type	Description	Reference
1	153	Jar type 1	The upper part of a jar-handle with a piece of the vessel body, decorated with six punctured dots at the right side of the handle. Light brown ware, grey core, many white inclusions.	Shiloh (Finkelstein, Bunimovitz, and Lederman 1993: 162, Fig. 6.61); Megiddo (Finkelstein and Zimhoni 2000: Fig. 11.3:11); Mount Ebal (Zertal 1987: Fig. 15).
2	143	Jar type 2	Jar rim, made of reddish-brown ware with very thin grey core, white lime inclusions, well fired.	Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 11:6), Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 12, pls. 1.10:20, 1.15:17), Givʿat Shaul (Zilberbod 2015: Fig. 12:9).
3	139	Jar type 2	Jar rim made of light brown-gray ware, with pinkish-brown core and greenish-white surface (clay slip?). This jar has a thickened rounded rim and sharply carinated shoulder, characteristics typical to a Judean type dated from the mid-8th to the early 6th centuries BCE.	ʿAnata (Reuben and Peleg 2009: 62, Fig. 1:7); Meẓadot-Yehuda (Aronshtam and Peleg 2009: 292, Fig. 1:4); Khirbet Abu-Musarraḥ (Peleg and Yezerski 2004: 120, Pl. 9:8); Noqdim (Peleg 2004: 199, Pl. 1:22); Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: pls. 1.11:38, 1.10: 21), Givʿat Shaul (Zilberbod 2015: Fig. 12:4); En-Gedi (Yezerski 2007: 100, Pl. 8:9).
4	137	Jar type 2	Rounded jar rim made of brown ware with grey core and white lime inclusions. Rounded ridge separates the rim and shoulder from the body.	Noqdim (Peleg 2004: 199, Pl. 1:22); Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 12, pls. 1.12:30), North Jerusalem (Barkay, Fantalkin, and Tal 2002: 59–65, figs. 15:10, 17: 21–22); Ḥorvat Rosh Zayit (Gal and Alexandre 2000: 173–174, Fig. VI.13:2).

Tab. 1: Iron Age pottery found at the installation.

5	132	Jar type 2	Jar rim made of light brown to grey-brown ware with grey core, interior spotted with many holes caused during firing.	Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 12, Pl. 1.1:9); Ḥorvat Rosh Zayit (Gal and Alexandre 2000: 173–174, Fig. VI.13:6–7); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 26:25) 7th–6th century BCE; Tel Batash (Mazar, Kelm, and Panitz-Cohen 2001: 105–107, Fig. 6: SJ 10) 8th to 7th/6th century BCE.
6	151	CP type 1	Heavy rounded ridged cooking pot rim made of thick coarse red-brown ware with grey core.	Samaria (Amiran 1969: 227, Pl. 75:21; Regev and Greenfeld 2013: Fig. 10:4); Tell el-Farah (North) (Chambon and Contenson 1984: 57, Pl. 47:7); Moẓa (Greenhut and De Groot 2009: 92, Fig. 3.15:1); Gezer (Gitin 1990: 68, pls. 14 A:2, 22 A:1); Beth-Shean (Mazar 2006: 342–345, Fig. 12.3); Dor (Gilboa 1995: 8, figs.1.1; 16–17; 1.5:20); Rosh ha-Ayin (Haddad 2011: Fig. 7:6–8); Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 8, pls. 1.1:24, 1.2:11, 1.6:5, 1.8:8,11, 1.9:13,24); Khirbet Yama (Northwestern Samaria hills) (Gal and Muqari 2002: 93–95, Fig. 6:11); Rumana (Lower Galilee) (Stepansky 2002: 115, Fig. 11:6–7).
7	123	CP type 2	Cooking pot rim made of brown ware with grey core and white inclusions.	Beersheba (Israel and Feder 2011: Fig. 12:10); Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 10:10).
8	102	CP type 3	A small fragment of handle and rim probably of a cooking jug made of brown ware with grey core and white inclusions.	Tell eṣ-Ṣafi (Zukerman 2012: 287–288, Pl. 13.2:19,21).

9	149	Bowl type 1	Bowl rim with handle, made of brown ware with grey core and white inclusions. Pink-orange thick slip burnished on the interior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.59:11); Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 6, pls. 1.1:19, 1.2:4, 1.3:6, 1.15:13), Givʿat Shaul (Zilberbod 2015: Fig. 11:12).
10	120	Bowl type 2	Bowl rim made of grayish-brown ware with grey core and white inclusions. Few wide burnishing lines on the interior.	Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 5, Pl. 1.12:16); Rumana (Stepansky 2002: 110, Fig. 6:9).
11	143	Bowl type 3	Bowl rim made of brown ware with grey core. Coarse burnish on the thickened rim.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.55:10); Rosh ha-Ayin (Haddad 2011: Fig. 6:1); Beth-Shean (Mazar 2006: 328–329, fig 12.1:BL 52).
12	129	Bowl type 3	Bowl rim made of brown ware with grey core. Smoothed interior.	Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 6, Pl. 1.11:27); Khirbet Yama (Gal and Muqari 2002: 93–95, Fig. 6:4).
13	143	Bowl type 3	Bowl rim made of brown ware and grey core. Smoothed interior.	Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 5, Pl. 1.12:4), Givat Shaul (Zilberbod 2015: Fig. 11:15).
14	131	Bowl type 4	Bowl rim made of light brown ware.	Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (Yezerski 2006: 86, pls. 3.1:7, 9, 3.2:9; De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 5, pls. 1.7: 19–20); Tel Batash (Mazar, Kelm, and Panitz-Cohen 2001: 39–40, Fig. 1: BL 13).
15	137	Bowl type 5	Bowl rim made of brown ware with grey core. Red-slip and burnish on rim and interior.	Jerusalem, Rogem Gannim (Greenberg and Cinamon 2011: 92, Fig. 21:4); Rumana (Stepansky 2019: 115, Fig. 11:2); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 27: 26).

Tab. 1: Iron Age pottery found at the installation (ctd.).

16	105	Bowl type 5	Bowl rim made of brown ware with light grey core and white lime inclusions. Few burnished lines on the exterior and rim's interior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.59:12); Rosh ha-Ayin (Haddad 2011: Fig. 7:3); Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 10:2), Jewish Quarter (De Groot, Geva, and Yezerski 2003: 5, pls. 1.4:9, 1.5:22, 1.7:29, 1.15: 14), Givʿat Shaul (Zilberbod 2015: Fig. 11: 13); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 27: 27); Meẓad Ḥashavyahu (Fantalkin 2001: 59, Fig. 24:1); Tel Nagila (Shai et al. 2011: 37, Fig. 11).
17	179	Bowl type 6	Bowl rim made of brown ware. Light brown slip on the rim and on the exterior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.59:4); Rosh ha-Ayin (Haddad 2011: Fig. 6:2); Tel Nagila (Shai et al. 2011: 35, Fig. 9:1); Aderet (Ein Mor 2019: Fig. 22:5).
18	146	Bowl type 6	Bowl made of brown ware with grey core. Light pinkish-brown thick slip, well burnished on interior and exterior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.59:3); Jerusalem, Jewish Quarter (Yezerski 2006: 85, pls. 3.1: 1, 3.2: 10); Khirbet Yama (Gal and Muqari 2002: 93–95, Fig. 7:2); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 27:23); Tel Nagila (Shai et al. 2011: 35, Fig. 9:2).
19	132	Bowl type 6	Bowl rim made of brown ware. Reddish brown slip and burnish on rim and the interior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.59:4); Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 9: 13–14); Aderet (Ein Mor 2019: Fig. 22:6).
20	132	Bowl type 6	Bowl rim made of brown ware with grey core.	Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 9:12); Meẓad Ḥashavyahu (Fantalkin 2001: 57, Fig. 23:11); Khirbet Yama (Gal and Muqari 2002: 93–95, Fig. 7: 1); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 27:32).
21	135 + 138	Bowl type 7	Bowl made of brown ware. Reddish-brown wash on the interior.	Ḥorvat Naẓur (Yannai 2010: Fig. 6:5); Khirbet Yama (Gal and Muqari 2002: 93–95, Fig. 7:7); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 27:29).

22	132	Bowl type 8	Bowl rim made of brown ware with light grey core and white inclusions. Burnished interior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.55:8); Rosh ha-Ayin (Haddad 2011: Fig.5: 2); Beersheba (Israel and Feder 2011: Fig. 12:6); Tell Beit Mirsim (Ben-Arieh 2004: 23, Fig. 2.54:49).
23	143	Bowl type 8	Bowl rim made of brown ware with white inclusions. Red-slipped and burnished interior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.55:8); Rosh ha-Ayin (Haddad 2011: Fig. 5:2); Beersheba, (Israel and Feder 2011: Fig. 12:6); Tell Beit Mirsim (Ben-Arieh 2004: 23, Fig. 2.54:49); Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 9:3); Meẓad Ḥashavyahu (Fantalkin 2001: 60, Fig. 23:14); Tel Nagila (Shai et al. 2011: 35, Fig. 9:7).
24	137	Bowl type 8	Bowl rim made of brown ware with grey core and white inclusions. Light brown thick slip and dense burnish on the interior and exterior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.55:8); Tell Beit Mirsim (Ben-Arieh 2004: 29, Fig. 2.78:7); Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 9:7), Jewish Quarter (Yezerski 2006: 85, pls. 3.1:4–5, 3.2:3); Meẓad Ḥashavyahu (Fantalkin 2001: 57, Fig. 23:16); Tel Nagila (Shai et al. 2011: 35, Fig. 9:7); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 27: 25).
25	107	Bowl type 8	Bowl rim made of brown-grey ware. Orange-brown slip and burnish on rim and the interior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.55:8); Tell Beit Mirsim (Ben-Arieh 2004: 23, figs. 2.54:49, 2.78:6); Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 9:3), Jewish Quarter (Yezerski 2006: 85, Pl. 3.2:3), Rogem Gannim (Greenberg and Cinamon 2011: 92, Fig. 21: 4); Meẓad Ḥashavyahu (Fantalkin 2001: 60, Fig. 23:14); Tel Nagila (Shai et al. 2011: 35, Fig. 9:6); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 27:28); Beersheba (Israel and Feder 2011: Fig. 12:5).

Tab. 1: Iron Age pottery found at the installation (ctd.).

26	112	Bowl type 8	Bowl rim made of brown ware with grey core and white inclusions. Traces of dull reddish-brown slip on the exterior and few burnished lines on the interior.	Tel ʿIra (Beit-Arieh 1999: Fig. 6.55:8); Jerusalem, Mount of Olives (Feig 2011: Fig. 9: 2), Givʿat Shaul (Zilberbod 2015: Fig. 11:4); Gezer (Gitin 1990: Pl. 27:24); Beersheba (Israel and Feder 2011: Fig. 12:4); Ḥorvat Ḥazzan (Peretz and Talis 2012: Fig. 15:3).
27	149	Bowl type 8	Bowl heavy low ring base made of brown ware with grey core. Red slip on the interior.	
28	143	Bowl type 8	Bowl heavy ring base made of brown-grey ware. Light red slip interior and exterior and burnished interior.	

Tab. 1: Iron Age pottery found at the installation (end).

REFERENCES

Aharonovich, Evgeny, 2019, Khirbet Kafr Mur, a Settlement in the Bethel Hills: An Intermediate Summery of Six Excavation Seasons: *Qadmoniot* 52, 28–38.

Amiran, Ruth, 1969, *The Ancient Pottery of Eretz Yisrael: From its Beginnings in the Neolithic Period to the End of the First Temple*, Jerusalem (in Hebrew).

Amit, David, 2007, Remains of Jewish Settlements from the Second Temple Period near Teddy Stadium, Jerusalem: *Eretz Israel* 28, 152–158.

Aronshtam, Eyal, and Yuval Peleg, 2009, An Iron Age IIB Structure at Metsadot Yehuda, in: Irit Yezerski (ed.), *Excavations and Discoveries in Benjamin and Judea* (Judea and Samaria Publications 10), Jerusalem, 290–293 (in Hebrew), 37 (English summary).

Barkay, Gabriel, Alexander Fantalkin, and Oren Tal, 2002, A Late Iron Age Fortress North of Jerusalem: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 328, 49–71.

Baruch, Eyal, 1998, The Economic Hinterland of Jerusalem in the Herodian Period: *Cathedra* 89, 41–62 (in Hebrew, with English abstract).

Batz, Shahar, 2006, To the Essence of the Columbaria Towers in the Desert Fringes in Light of the Recent Excavations in the Yattir Region: *The Frontier and the Desert in the Land of Israel* 1, 49–63 (in Hebrew).

Beit-Arieh, Itzhaq, 1999, *Tel 'Ira: A Stronghold in the Biblical Negev*, Tel Aviv.

Ben-Arieh, Sarah, 2000, Salvage Excavations Near the Holyland Hotel, Jerusalem: *'Atiqot* 40, 1–24.

Ben-Arieh, Sarah, 2004, *Bronze and Iron Age Tombs at Tell Beit Mirsim*, Jerusalem.

Carenti, Gabriele, and Giuseppe Minunno, 2013, The Role of Birds in Tell Afis (Syria): Sacrifices and Rituals in a Temple Area during the Iron Age, in: Luca Bombardieri, Anacleto D'Agostino, Guido Guarducci, Valentina Orsi, and Stefano Valentini (eds.), *Identity and Connectivity. Proceedings of the 16th Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology, Florence* (BAR International Series 2581 [I]), Oxford, 119–126.

Chambon, Alain, and Henri de Contenson, 1984, *Tell el-Far'ah I: l'âge du fer*, Paris.

De Groot, Alon, Hillel Geva, and Irit Yezerski, 2003, The Pottery of the Iron Age II from Areas A, W and X-2, in: Hillel Geva (ed.), *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jeruslem, Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982, Vol. II: The Finds from Areas A, W and X-2, Final Report*, Jerusalem, 1–49.

Ein Mor, Daniel, 2019, Aderet. Final Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot. Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 131.

Fantalkin, Alexander, 2001, Meẓad Ḥashavyahu: Its Material Culture and Historical Background: *Tel Aviv* 28, 3–165.

Faust, Avraham, 2007, Jerusalem's Hinterland and the City's Status in the Iron Age: *Eretz Israel* 28, 165–172.

Feig, Nurit, 2011, An Iron-Age II Dwelling Cave on the Mount of Olives, Jerusalem: *ʾAtiqot* 67, 41–59 (in Hebrew), 86–87 (English summary).

Finkelstein, Israel, and Orna Zimhoni, 2000, The Pottery from the Late Bronze Age Gate, in: Israel Finkelstein, David Ussishkin, and Baruch Halpern (eds.), *Megiddo III: the 1992–1996 Seasons*, Tel Aviv, 223–324.

Finkelstein, Israel, Shlomo Bunimovitz, and Zvi Lederman, 1993, *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site*, Tel Aviv.

Gal, Zvi, and Abdullah Muqari, 2002, Excavations at Khirbet Yama (Yahem) in the Sharon Plain, in: Zvi Gal (ed.), *Eretz Ẓafon: Studies in Galilean Archaeology*, Haifa, 91–106 (in Hebrew).

Gal, Zvi, and Yardenna Alexandre, 2000, *Ḥorbat Rosh Zayit. An Iron Age Storage Fort and Village* (IAA Reports 8), Jerusalem.

Gilboa, Ayelet, 1995, The Typology and Chronology of the Iron Age Pottery and the Chronology of Iron Age Assemblages, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor, Final Report Vol. IB: Areas A and C. The Finds* (Qedem Reports 2), Jerusalem, 1–49.

Gitin, Seymour, 1990, *Gezer III: Ceramic Typology of the Late Iron II, Persian and Hellenistic Periods at Tel Gezer*, Jerusalem.

Greenberg, Raphael, and Gilad Cinamon, 2011, Excavations at Rogem Gannim, Jerusalem: Installations of the Iron Age, Persian, Roman and Islamic periods: *ʾAtiqot* 66, 79–106.

Greenhut, Zvi, 1997, Village Settlements in the Periphery of Jerusalem from the Early Roman to the Byzantine Period, in: Shimon Dar and Ze'ev Safrai (eds.), *The Village in Ancient Israel*, Ramat-Gan, 147–160 (in Hebrew).

Greenhut, Zvi, and Alon De Groot, 2009, *Salvage Excavations at Tel Moẓa: the Bronze and Iron Age Settlements and Later Occupations* (IAA Reports 39), Jerusalem.

Haddad, Elie, 2011, Rosh Haʿ Ayin, Miẓpe Afeq: Remains of an Agricultural Settlement from the Iron Age to the Hellenistic Period (with a contribution by Gabriela Bijovsky): *ʾAtiqot* 65, 53–63 (in Hebrew), 67 (English summary).

Herzog, Ze'ev, and Lily Singer-Avitz, 2016, *Beer Sheba III: The Early Iron IIA Enclosed Settlement and the Late Iron IIA-Iron IIB Cities*, Winona Lake, IN.

Israel, Yigal, and Oded Feder, 2011, An Iron Age and Hellenistic-period Site near Be'er Shevaʿ (with a contribution of Moshe Sade): *ʾAtiqot* 67, 61–80 (in Hebrew), 88 (English summary).

Itach, Gilad, Dalit Regev, and Hananya Hizmi, 2018, Ḥorvat ʿAli, a Farmstead from the End of the Iron Age in Mount Ephraim: *Qadmoniot* 155, 32–36.

Kakish, Randa, 2012, Evidence for Dove Breeding in the Iron Age: A Newly Discovered Dovecote at ʿAin al-Baida/ʿAmman: *Jordan Journal for History and Archaeology* 6, 185–193.

Khairy, Nabil, and Randa Kakish, 2013, Pottery Vessels from a Newly Discovered Ammonite Dovecote at Ain Al-Baida, Amman: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 145, 220–230.

Kletter, Raz, Irit Ziffer, and Wolfgang Zwickel, 2015, *Yavneh II: The "Temple Hill" Repository Pit* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 36), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Lambert, Wilfred G., 1970, The Sultantepe Tablets: IX. The Birdcall Text: *Anatolian Studies* 20, 111–117.

Magen, Yitzhak, 2004, Qalandiya – A Second Temple-period Viticulture and Wine-Manufacturing Agricultural Settlement, in: id. (ed.), *The Land of Benjamin*, Jerusalem, 29–144.

Mazar, Amihai, 2006, The Iron Age II Pottery from Areas S and P, in: id. (ed.), *Excavations at Tel Beth-Shean 1989–1996, Volume I: From the Late Bronze Age IIB to the Medieval Period*, Jerusalem, 314–467.

Mazar, Amihay, George L. Kelm, and Nava Panitz-Cohen, 2001, *Timnah (Tel Batash) II, The Finds from the First Millennium BCE*, Jerusalem.

Mazor, Gaby, 1996, A Columbarium Cave at Ras Esh-Sheikh ʿAnbar, East of Jerusalem: *ʾAtiqot* 29: 51–55 (in Hebrew).

Mazor, Gaby, 2006, A Farmhouse from the Late Iron Age and Second Temple Period in 'French Hill', North Jerusalem: *ʾAtiqot* 1–29 (in Hebrew), 153–154 (English summary).

Minunno, Giuseppe, 2013, *Ritual Employs of Birds in Ancient Syria-Palestine*, Münster.

Peleg, Yuval, 2004, An Iron Age Site at Noqdim, in: Hananya Hizmi and Alon De Groot (eds.), *Burial Caves and Sites in Judea and Samaria from the Bronze and Iron Ages* (Judea and Samaria Publications 4), Jerusalem, 189–205.

Peleg, Yuval, and Irit Yezerski, 2004, A Dwelling and Burial Cave at Kh. Abū-Musarraḥ in the Land of Benjamin, in: Hananya Hizmi and Alon De Groot (eds.), *Burial Caves and Sites in Judea and Samaria from the Bronze and Iron Ages* (Judea and Samaria Publications 4), Jerusalem, 107–156.

Peretz, Ilan, and Svetlana Talis, 2012, Ḥorbat Ḥazzan and Ḥorbat Avraq. Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot. Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 124.

Pinnock, Frances, 2014, Of Pots and Doves. Some Possible Evidence for Popular Cults in the Ebla Palaces in MB II, in: Piotr Bieliński, Michał Gawlikowski,

and Rafał Koliński (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East: 30 April–4 May 2012, University of Warsaw*, Wiesbaden, 667–679.

Rahmani, Levi Y., 1982, A Tomb and a Columbarium on Shemuel Hanavi Street: *ʾAtiqot* 8, 61–64 (in Hebrew), 7 (English summary).

Regev, Dalit, and Uzi Greenfeld, 2013, New Finds from the Samaria-Sebaste Necropolis, in: Mehmet Tekocak (ed.), *Studies in Honour of K. Levent Zoroğlu*, Istanbul, 541–568.

Regev, Dalit, and Lior Shapira, 2013, A Farmstead Cave at Abu Dis and its Installations as part of the Industrial Belt Surrounding Jerusalem: *Judea and Samaria Research Studies* 22, 67–83.

Reuben, Amichai, and Yuval Peleg, 2009, Caves, Winepresses, and Three-Room Structure to the East of An'ata, in: Irit Yezerski (ed.), *Excavations and Discoveries in Benjamin and Judea* (Judea and Samaria Publications 9), Jerusalem, 57–64 (in Hebrew), 7 (English summary).

Safrai, Ze'ev, 2010, Agriculture and farming, in: Catherine Hezser (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine*, Oxford, 246–263.

Sari, Kamil, 2010, ʿAtlit. Preliminary Report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot. Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 122.

Seligman, Jon, 1999, Agricultural Complexes at Ras Abu Maʿaruf (Pisgat Ze'ev East A), North of Jerusalem: *ʾAtiqot* 38, 137–170.

Seligman, Jon, 2006, Jerusalem, Khirbat Kaʿkul (Pisgat Ze'ev H): Early Roman Farmsteads and a Medieval Village: *ʾAtiqot* 54, 1–73.

Seligman, Jon, 2009, Oil and Wine Presses at Ras Abu Maʿaruf (Pisgat Ze'ev East 'A), in: Etan Ayalon, Rafael Frankel, and Amos Kloner (eds.), *Oil and Wine Presses in Israel from the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Oxford, 277–288.

Seligman, Jon, and Rafa Abu Raya, 2000, Dwelling Caves on the Mount of Olives (Eṭ-Ṭur), *ʾAtiqot* 40, 123–138.

Shai, Itzhaq, David Ilan, Aren M. Maeir, and Joe Uziel, 2011, The Iron Age Remains at Tel Nagila: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 363, 25–43.

Soldi, Sebastiano, 2019, Architectural Glazed Decorations in the Iron Age Northern Levant: Two Case Studies from Tell Afis (Syria) and Zincirli (Turkey): *Asia Anteriore Antica* 1, 185–206.

Stepansky, Yosef, 2002, Salvage Excavations at Rumana, in: Zvi Gal (ed.), *Eretz Ẓafon: Studies in Galilean Archaeology*, Haifa, 107–118 (in Hebrew), 180 (English summary).

Stepansky, Yosef, 2019, Settlement Remains from the Iron Age, Hellenistic, Roman-Byzantine and Early Islamic Periods on the Ancient Tell of Rosh Pinna (Jaʿuna): *ʾAtiqot* 96, 1–58.

Sugimoto, David T. (ed.), 2014, *Transformation of a Goddess: Ishtar – Astarte – Aphrodite* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 263), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Tsuk, Tsvika, 2000, *Ancient Water Systems in Settlements in Eretz-Israel (from the Neolithic Period to the End of the Iron Age)*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Tel Aviv University.

Weinfeld, Moše, 1991, Semiramis. Her Name and Her Origin, in: Mordechai Kogan and Israel Ephʿal (eds.), *Ah, Assyria.... Studies in Assyrian history and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 33), Jerusalem, 99–103.

Yannai, Eli, 2010, Ḥorbat Naẓur: Settlement Remains from the Iron Age through the Hellenistic Period and an Industrial Area from the Byzantine Period (with contributions by Roni Tuag and Varda Sussman): *ʾAtiqot* 64, 63–97 (in Hebrew), 156–159 (English summary).

Yezerski, Irit, 2006, Iron Age II Pottery, in: Hillel Geva (ed.), *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem, Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982. Vol. III: Area E and other Studies, Final Report*, Jerusalem, 1–49.

Yezerski, Irit, 2007, Pottery of Stratum V, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *En-Gedi Excavations I, Conducted by Benjamin Mazar and Immanuel Dunayevsky, Final report (1961–1965)*, Jerusalem, 86–132.

Zertal, Adam, 1987, An Early Iron Age Cultic Site on Mount Ebal: Excavation Seasons 1982–1987: Preliminary Report: *Tel Aviv* 14, 105–165.

Ziffer, Irit, 1998, *O my Dove, that Art in the Clefts of the Rock – The Dove-Allegory in Antiquity*, Tel Aviv.

Zilberbod, Irina, 2015, Jerusalem, Givʿat Sha'ul. Final report: *Hadashot Arkheologiyot. Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 127.

Zissu, Boaz, 1995, Two Herodian Dovecotes: Horvat Abu Haf and Horvat ʿAleq, in: John H. Humphrey (ed.), *The Roman and Byzantine Near East. Some Recent Archaeological Research* (Journal of Roman Archaeology, Supplementary Series Number 14), Ann Arbor, MI, 56–69.

Zissu, Boaz, 2001, *Rural Settlement in the Judean Hills and Foothills from the Late Second Temple Period to the Bar Kokhba Revolt*, PhD Thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem (in Hebrew).

Zissu, Boaz, 2009, The Place is for the Birds: *The Biblical Archaeology Review* 35: 30–37, 66.

Zukerman, Alexander, 2012, Iron Age I and Early Iron Age IIA Pottery, in: Aren M. Maeir (ed.), *Tell eṣ-Ṣafi/Gath I. The 1996–2005 Seasons. Volume 1: Text* (Ägypten und Altes Testament 69), Wiesbaden, 265–311.

GÖTTIN UND LÖWE – EINE DAUERHAFTE LIAISON

Silvia Schroer

The article is concerned with two objects, a scaraboid of the Persian period and a bronze seal of the Hellenistic period. The only thing they have in common is that they continue to transmit and thereby modify an old iconographic connection, namely that between goddess and lion(s). The preference for motifs that were still familiar from tradition may have played a role in the selection and creative re-creations of later periods. Difficulties in interpreting the finds arise in both cases examined from the lack of close and informative parallel pieces.

Wie fanden die Auswahlprozesse religiöser Symbole in der persischen und hellenistischen Zeit statt? Wie speziell, provinziell, regional, lokal, gruppenspezifisch waren die Interessen, die zur Beschaffung, zum Kauf, zur Herstellung bestimmter Objekte der Kleinkunst führten? Ob Herstellung oder Import/Handel – es wurde gewählt. Manches interessierte und anderes nicht, manches gefiel, anderes nicht. Es ist jedoch schwierig, Zufall und Intention bei Grabungsfunden voneinander zu unterscheiden. Unter den Bullen vom Wadi ed-Daliyeh kommen beispielsweise keine Göttinnen vor außer Nike.[1] Aber wie signifikant sind solche Befunde?

Wenn Selektion im Spiel ist, dann dürfte die Kenntnis bzw. das Wiedererkennen alter Konstellationen in einer traditionsgeprägten antiken Kultur ein entscheidendes Auswahlkriterium gewesen sein. Auch in Zeiten großer Veränderungen oder wenn verschiedene kulturelle Einflüsse aufeinandertreffen, ist unter dem Wandel und den Neuerungen oft die Vorliebe für Traditionelles erkennbar. Umgekehrt finden Figuren oder Themen, die überhaupt keine einheimische Vorgeschichte oder Anknüpfung haben, schwerer Eingang in die Symbolwelt einer neuen Ära.

Die Verbindung von Göttin und Löwe, um die es in diesem Beitrag geht, dürfte in der Levante bei Menschen verschiedenster Herkunft einen Wiedererkennungseffekt ausgelöst haben, denn sie greift auf eine sehr alte Tradition zurück, die in Vorderasien bis ins Neolithikum zurückreicht.[2] Auch Texte rufen, oft viele Jahrhunderte später, solche Wiedererkennungen ab, z.B. die Liebesmetaphorik des Hohenlieds, in welchem die Geliebte mit Löwen (Hld 4,8) und beide Liebenden mit Tauben (Hld 1,15; 4,1; 5,12) assoziiert werden, aber auch die neutestamentlichen Erzählungen von der Taufe Jesu am Jordan, wo die mit

[1] Schroer/Lippke 2014: 337, Abb. 112; 365.

[2] Vgl. dazu Keel 1984: 39–45; Schroer/Keel 2005: No. 29; Schroer 2008: No. 449.

einer göttlichen Liebeserklärung verbundene Taube (Mk 1,9–11 und Parallelen) die alte syrische und kanaanäische Konstellation der erotischen Göttin und der Taube „aktiviert".[3]

Ich möchte im Folgenden zwei Funde aus der Glyptik Palästinas/Israels auf dem Hintergrund dieser traditionellen Motivgeschichte kommentieren und kontextualisieren. Ein dritter gehört, wie sich klären ließ, nicht in die hellenistische Epoche, sondern wahrscheinlich in die römische Kaiserzeit.

1. Skaraboid aus Khirbet Qeiyafa: Eine stehende Göttin über dem Löwen

Patrick Wyssmann und ich haben vor einigen Jahren ein Skaraboid aus Khirbet Qeiyafa in der Schefela veröffentlicht.[4] Es wurde 2009 in einer Schicht gefunden, die aufgrund von Münzen in die spätpersische oder frühe hellenistische Zeit (350–270 v.u.Z.) datiert wurde (**Abb. 1a–b)**. Das Siegel dürfte allerdings etwas älter sein. Glassiegel waren im 5./4. Jh. v.u.Z. besonders verbreitet.

Auf bzw. über einem nach links schreitenden Löwen steht eine Gestalt nach links blickend in einem langen Gewand. Sie hält in der nach vorn gestreckten Hand eine Lanze wie ein Zepter. Das Maul des Löwen ist weit aufgerissen, er brüllt also und wird so als aggressiv gekennzeichnet. Vor dem Löwen ist ein Thymiaterion erkennbar, darauf wohl ein Räucherkuchen mit Rauchfahne.

Das Problem bei diesem Siegel ist eine Beschädigung ausgerechnet im Bereich des Kopfes der stehenden Figur, sodass nicht geklärt werden kann, ob es sich um einen Löwenkopf oder einen Frauenkopf handelt. Unser Vorschlag ist, dass es sich um einen Löwenkopf mit Perücke, vergleichbar den Sachmet-Darstellungen, handelt, darüber eine Sonnenscheibe mit Uräus. In unserem Beitrag haben wir als engste Parallelen zu diesem Stück phönizische Siegel und Bullen aus dem Mittelmeerraum, Ibiza und Karthago, aufgeführt. Keine der Göttinnen auf diesen Siegeln weist jedoch einen Löwenkopf auf. Vor allem ein als enge Parallele zu bewertendes Jaspissiegel aus einem Grab in Ibiza (**Abb. 2**) könnte nahelegen, dass auch auf dem Glassiegel aus Khirbet Qeiyafa ein Frauen-, nicht ein Tierkopf eingeritzt war.[5]

[3] Keel 1984: 39–45; 53–62; Schroer 1986.

[4] Vgl. im Folgenden Schroer/Wyssmann 2012 (dort ausführlichere Angaben zu Parallelen und Motivketten); auf Englisch in Garfinkel et al. 2018: 333–341. Ich danke an dieser Stelle Patrick Wyssmann für verschiedene Hinweise zum vorliegenden Beitrag.

[5] Es gibt seit der Eisenzeit IIA Terrakotten, bei denen Frauen- und Löwinnengesichter anscheinend schillernd ineinander übergehen, so vom Tell Zira'a in Jordanien (Vieweger/Häser 2007: 13 Fig. 10; Schroer 2018: No. 1178 und dort die Angaben zu den Parallelen) und drei Terrakottaköpfchen vom Ofel in Jerusalem (E. Mazar 2015: 473 Fig. III.1.5; 537–539 Fig. III.3.8–10). Unter den in el-Khadr bei Betlehem gefundenen Pfeilspitzen, auf denen die Namen der Besitzer eingeritzt

Abb. 1a–b: Skaraboid aus Khirbet Qeiyafa
(Schroer/Wyssmann 2012: Taf. 21 A und 158 Abb. 1).

Abb. 2: Siegelabdruck eines Jaspisskarabäus aus Ibiza
(Boardman 1984: Pl. 11 No. 60; Schroer/Wyssmann 2012: Taf. 21 C).

Aus der vorderasiatischen Tradition kennen wir Göttinnen, die auf Löwen stehen und damit als Vorgängertypen der phönizischen Siegel gelten können. Göttinnen, die häufig mit dem Namen der Ischtar identifiziert werden, treten zwar seit der Akkad-Zeit oft nur mit einem Bein in Dominanzpose auf den Löwen,[6] aber später stehen sie auf dem schreitenden Löwen als Trägertier.[7] Nicht nur Ischtar, auch Ḫepat oder viel später die Anahita stehen auf dem Löwen.[8]

sind, taucht der Name ʿAbdlabît »Diener der Löwin« auf, der ebenfalls auf die alte Verbindung von Göttin und Löwe hinweisen dürfte (Keel/Uehlinger [5]2001: 144–146 mit Fig. 156–157).

[6] Schroer/Keel 2005: Nos. 258–260; Schroer 2008: No. 434.

[7] Schroer 2008: No. 448.

[8] Schroer 2011: No. 984; Schroer 2018: Nos. 1325.1626.1871–1872. Seit der späteren Mittelbronzezeit, vor allem aber in der Spätbronzezeit, gibt es an der Küste Metallanhänger mit der Frontaldarstellung einer Göttin auf dem Löwen (Schroer 2011: Nos. 859–863), ein Typus, der im Neuen Reich in Ägypten sehr viel Anklang fand (Qedeschet), dort aber auf Stelen zwischen ägyptischen Göttern wie Min und asiatischen wie Reschef erscheint (Keel 1992: 203–208; Schroer 2011: Nos. 866–868). Diese Göttin ist immer nackt dargestellt. Sie findet noch bis in die frühe Eisenzeit ein gewisses Interesse (Schroer 2018: Nos. 1195.1233), danach ist sie noch in der phönizischen Elfen-

Für die Bekleidung und die Schrittstellung der Figur auf dem Skaraboid aus Khirbet Qeiyafa kann auf Sachmet-Darstellungen der Kleinkunst verwiesen werden. Die löwenköpfige Sachmet steht aber in keiner Epoche selbst auf einem Löwen. Ein Sachmet-Amulett aus einem Grab in Marescha[9] zeigt, dass auch die ägyptische Tradition der felidenköpfigen Göttin in Palästina/Israel bis in die hellenistische Zeit vorkommt. Die in der klassischen ägyptischen Ikonographie immer vollständig bekleidet dargestellte Sachmet erscheint dabei schon seit der Eisenzeit IIB in der levantinischen Kunst leicht erotisiert.[10]

2. Bronzesiegel aus Dor: Eine geflügelte Göttin zwischen Löwen

Ein Bronzesiegel aus Dor zeigt eine geflügelte Göttin zwischen zwei Löwen, die sich in heraldischer Pose an ihr aufrichten (**Abb. 3**). Das Siegel in Form einer rechteckigen gravierten Platte, wahrscheinlich Teil eines Rings, ist verschollen, sodass Details der flächigen Gravur nicht am Original überprüft werden können. Auch handelt es sich um einen Oberflächenfund.[11] Dieser wurde von Ephraim Stern ins 4. Jh. v.u.Z. datiert. Die Datierung ist allerdings nicht abgesichert. Sie basiert einzig auf Sterns Interpretation der abgebildeten Figuren. Stern wollte die Szene als „heroic combat" der persischen Tradition einordnen und erkannte in der Hauptgestalt einen behelmten Krieger mit Brustpanzer, der zwei Löwen dominiert. Damit ergab sich für ihn zugleich eine Gruppe von perserzeitlichen Siegeln aus Dor mit Figuren des „heroic combat". Othmar Keel hat sich Sterns Datierung zwar angeschlossen, seine Deutung aber gar nicht diskutiert und selbst eine ganz andere Interpretation vorgenommen. Er deutet die Hauptgestalt als geflügelte Göttin, die von zwei Löwen flankiert wird. Keel denkt bei der geflügelten Göttin an eine Nike, weil diese in der Koroplastik von Dor vorkomme, zeigt

beinkunst anzutreffen (Schroer 2018: No. 1560). Anahita dürfte auf einem Rollsiegel aus Gorgippa dargestellt sein (Collon 1987: No. 432).

[9] Herrmann 2006: 74f KatNo. 49 Taf. XIII. Das Amulett hat die traditionelle Gestalt der löwenköpfigen Göttin mit Sonnenscheibe und Uräus auf dem Kopf, in leichter Schrittstellung. Die Göttin wirkt praktisch nackt oder das Kleid ist durchsichtig. Vgl. ein Sachmet-Amulett unbekannter Herkunft aus Palästina/Israel (mit Papyruszepter) bei Herrmann/Staubli 2010: 4 No 4.

[10] Sachmet-Amulette sind in der Eisenzeit IIA–B außerordentlich häufig, vor allem in Lachisch, Bet Schemesch, auch noch im 7. Jh. v.u.Z. in Jerusalem, Lachisch u.a. Orten anzutreffen. Christian Herrmann hat den Typ zuletzt nicht mehr als Sachmet bezeichnet, sondern als felidenköpfige Göttin.

[11] Stern 1992: 96, Fig. 128; 1995: 476–478, Fig. 10.1:3; photo 10.3; [2]2000: 191, Fig. 124; Keel 2010: Dor No. 10. Keel verweist auf Boardman 1970: Pl. 722 und die Bulle aus Wadi ed-Daliyeh mit einer Nike in der Quadriga (Keel 2010: Wadi ed-Dalije No. 33; Schroer/Lippke 2014: 337, Abb. 112). Ähnlich ist aber in beiden Fällen allenfalls die Darstellung der nach unten gerichteten Flügel der Göttin.

Abb. 3: Bronzesiegel aus Dor (Keel 2010: Dor No. 10).

sich aber irritiert, dass diese auf dem Siegel quasi kombiniert wird mit dem Typ einer Kybele, der Göttin zwischen Löwen.[12]

Tatsächlich gibt es bei dem Fundstück einige Eigenheiten, die eine Zuordnung zu bekannten Typen erschweren. Schon der Bildträger ist ungewöhnlich, denn rechteckige Siegelplaketten aus Bronze, auch als Teile eines Rings, sind bis dato gänzlich unbekannt.

Das Motiv der Göttin, die zwischen Löwen steht, ist nicht so alt wie das der zwischen Löwen thronenden Herrin. Eine zwischen aufgerichteten Löwen stehende Göttin begegnet zuerst in der frühsyrischen Glyptik auf einem Rollsiegelabdruck aus Ebla (2400–2300 v.u.Z.).[13] Hier werden die Löwen, die gleich groß sind wie die Göttin, als gefährliche Monster gekennzeichnet, welche die Göttin mit festem Griff bezwingt. Fast tausend Jahre später erscheint in der kretischen Glyptik, auf einem Stempelsiegel aus Knossos, eine Göttin auf dem Berg als Löwendompteurin. Die Tiere nehmen aber zu ihren Füßen am Berg aufgerichtet eher eine Wächterposition ein und wirken nun weniger bedrohlich.[14] Die Göttin Kybele steht auf Reliefs des 3./2. Jh. v.u.Z. bisweilen zwischen sitzenden Löwen, die an Wappentiere erinnern.[15] Die Göttin auf dem Siegel aus Dor blickt und schreitet nach links. Sie trägt ein bis zu den Knöcheln herabfallendes Gewand, das durchsichtig wirkt und die Brüste hervorhebt. Kopf und allfällige Kopfbedeckung sind nicht gut zu sehen. Ein Helm ist nicht erkennbar. Sterns Idee, dass es sich um einen Krieger in der persischen Pose des Löwenbezwingers handle, scheitert nicht zuletzt auch daran, dass Krieger keine langen Gewänder tragen. Die Flügel der Göttin schwingen sich von ihren Schultern beidseits weit herab, sodass die beiden sich aufrichtenden Löwen links und rechts unter diesen

[12] Vgl. zur Kybele das Standardwerk von Naumann 1983, zu den hellenistischen Terrakotten ebd. 269–275; grundlegend ist auch der große Beitrag von Erika Simon, LIMC 8,1,744–766.

[13] Die frontal dargestellte Göttin ist oben nackt (Keel 1984: Abb. 17).

[14] Stempelsiegel aus dem sog. Palast des Minos in Knossos (Keel 1984: Abb. 28).

[15] Vgl. die frontal abgebildete Kybele mit Tympanon auf dem Relief aus Izmir, 3./2. Jh. v.u.Z. (LIMC Kybele 19).

Flügeln stehen. Die Göttin scheint die Tiere, deren Köpfe nur bis zur Höhe ihrer Oberschenkel reichen, mit ihren Händen zu berühren oder zu halten.

Naheliegend ist bei dieser Pose eine Deutung als Schutzgöttin, unter deren Flügeln sich die Wildtiere einfinden. Um welche Göttin kann es sich handeln? Eine Anzahl Terrakotten aus Dor, Marescha und Akko bezeugen die Kenntnis der klassischen Kybele-Ikonographie in der hellenistischen Zeit.[16] Die zwischen Löwen oder auf einem Löwenthron sitzende Göttin geht als Typ zurück in das 6. Jahrtausend. Flügel gehören aber grundsätzlich nicht zu den Attributen der Löwenthronerinnen, auch nicht der Kybele. Die Frontaldarstellung des Oberkörpers und die trotz Bekleidung sehr betonten Brüste, erinnern eher an nubische Löwengöttinnen der 25. Dyn. (746–715 v.u.Z.), wie sie beispielsweise ein Fayence-Amulett aus el-Kurru (**Abb. 4**) zeigt.[17]

Der Löwenkopf dieser nubischen Göttin steht in der Sachmet-Tradition, ihre frontale Nacktheit hingegen in der vorderasiatischen Tradition der erotischen Göttinnen. Die Flügel spreizt sie mit ausgestreckten Armen fast wie einen Mantel. Die Gewandung der Gestalt auf dem Siegel aus Dor und die schreitende Pose haben auch Ähnlichkeit mit Nike-Darstellungen der hellenistischen Zeit, insbesondere auf Münzen. Die Flügel der Nike fallen aber nie von den Schultern herab, sondern überragen diese, am Rücken angebracht, beträchtlich, wie auf der makedonischen Münze des Demetrios Poliorketes (306–283 v.u.Z.) (**Abb. 5**).[18] Ein gewichtiger Grund, warum es sich bei dem Siegel aus Dor mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit nicht um die Göttin Nike handelt, auch wenn diese in Dor in der Koroplastik[19] eine Rolle spielt, ist, dass Nike nie mit flankierenden Löwen dargestellt wird.

Die einzige Göttin, die mit Löwen vergesellschaftet wird und dabei zugleich geflügelt erscheinen kann, ist Artemis. Sie nimmt in der griechischen Vasenmalerei im 7./6. Jh. v.u.Z. oft die Pose einer Herrin der Tiere ein, so auf einer Hals-

[16] Vgl. Keel/Schroer [3]2008: 242–244, No. 225 und Fig. 226a–b. Kybele wird auch ohne Löwen (Marescha) dargestellt, möglicherweise sind dieser Göttin auch Köpfchen mit Mauerkrone zuzuordnen.

[17] Fayence-Amulett aus el-Kurru, südlich von Napata (Sudan), Zeit des Pije, 25. Dyn. (746–715 v.u.Z.).

[18] Die Haltung der Flügel mit der gut sichtbaren Alula (Daumenfeder) entspricht in etwa der eines Vogels, der eben im Begriff ist, sich in die Luft zu schwingen. Vgl. LIMC Nike 424.426.594.

[19] Terrakotten in Dor und Marescha repräsentieren die hellenistische Götterwelt in stattlicher Auswahl. In Dor sind Nike, Artemis, Aphrodite, Eros und Satyr bezeugt, in Marescha Athena, Artemis, Aphrodite, Gorgo sowie Eros, Herakles, Apoll und Hypnos. Auch die zahlreichen Bullen von Tel Kedesch repräsentieren praktisch den kompletten griechischen Götter- und Heldenhimmel mit Artemis, Athena, Isis, Nike und Tyche sowie Apoll, Dionysos, Eros, Helios, Hephaistos, Herakles, Hermes und und Zeus.



Abb. 4: Fayence-Amulett aus el-Kurru (Schroer 2018: No. 1487).

Abb. 5: Makedonische Münze mit einer geflügelten Nike,
die Kranz und Stylis hält (LIMC Nike 603).

Abb. 6: Hämatitskarabäus mit einer geflügelten Artemis
als Potnia Theron (LIMC Artemis 36).

amphore aus der Umgebung von Theben in Böotien.[20] Mit Flügeln tritt sie auf einer Lekythe aus dem 6. Jh. v.u.Z.[21] und auf einem Skarabäus derselben Zeit (**Abb. 6**) auf.[22] Bei diesen Darstellungen sind die Flügelspitzen allerdings nach oben geschwungen, nur die Armstellung ist der Pose der Göttin auf dem Siegel aus Dor ähnlich. Vergleichbar ist auch die berühmte Hydria aus Graechwil in der Schweiz, ursprünglich aus Tarent (6. Jh. v.u.Z.), die eine vollplastische Figurengruppe auf der Krugschulter trägt. Eine geflügelte, bekleidete Göttin mit großen Brüsten steht hier zwischen zwei sitzenden Löwen, die in heraldischer Manier eine Pfote heben, welche die Göttin ergreift.[23] Die etruskische Tradition führt die geflügelte Potnia Theron unter dem Namen Artumes noch bis in die hellenistische Epoche weiter, wobei die Löwen näher an die Göttin heranrücken.[24]

3. Bemerkungen zu einem nicht hellenistischen Siegelabdruck aus Samaria: Eine auf dem Löwen reitende Göttin

Ein Siegelabdruck auf einer Tonbulle aus Samaria[25] zeigt in Frontaldarstellung eine auf einem Löwen sitzende oder reitende Göttin (**Abb. 7**). Bei diesem Motiv handelt es sich wahrscheinlich um die auf dem Löwen reitende Kybele, wie sie auf einem attischen Vasenfragment des 4. Jh. v.u.Z. zu sehen ist.[26] Später ist sie, wenngleich seitlich, d.h. im Damensitz, sitzend, auf Münzen anzutreffen, wo sie mit der Dea Syria oder Atargatis verbunden wird (**Abb. 8**).[27] In der hellenistischen Zeit war die Löwenreiterin in der Terrakottakunst sehr beliebt. Siegel oder Siegelabdrücke mit diesem Motiv sind bislang aus dieser Zeit nicht gefunden

[20] LIMC Artemis 21; Schroer 2018: No. 1933. Die brüllenden Löwen stehen antithetisch unter den weit ausgebreiteten Armen der Göttin, die aber in diesem Fall fast mehr an Äste als an Flügel erinnern. Dieser Eindruck wird durch die auf den Armen sitzenden Vögel verstärkt.

[21] LIMC Artemis 34.

[22] Ob es sich bei der Terrakottaplakette des 6. Jh. v.u.Z. aus Sardes (LIMC Artemis 37) wirklich um eine Artemis handelt, scheint mir zweifelhaft, da die Füsse gefiedert sind.

[23] Bernisches Historisches Museum 2002; LIMC Artemis 47.

[24] Vgl. die Terrakotta-Appliken aus Capua (LIMC Artumes 10a) und Falerii, 3. Jh. v.u.Z. (LIMC Artumes 11). Bei der Figur aus Falerii sind die Flügelspitzen nach unten gedreht.

[25] Die Publikation von Crowfoot/Crowfoot (1957: XIV; 88) gibt bezüglich Fundort die Nordostecke der Hügelkuppe und Locus QY 0182 an. Sie vermuteten, dass es sich bei der auf dem Löwen Sitzenden um Astarte handeln könnte und datierten den Fund vorsichtig in die hellenistische Zeit.

[26] LIMC Kybele 88. Das Motiv kommt auf verschiedenen plastischen Bildträgern vor, in Stein und in Bronze, so im böotischen Theben und in Galyub (Ippel 1922: Nos. 1–2). Die Göttin liegt dabei eher lasziv auf dem Tier, als dass sie reitet.

[27] LIMC Dea Syria 4. Das Motiv des Löwenritts der Kybele geht auf den Maler Nikomachos im 4. Jh. v.u.Z. zurück, jedenfalls berichtet dies Plinius (*Naturalis Historia* 35.108–109); vgl. LIMC 8,758–759. Am Pergamonaltar (180/160 v.u.Z.) sprengt sie dann über gefallene Giganten.

Abb. 7 (links): Abdruck, wahrscheinlich einer Gemme, aus Samaria (Crowfoot/Crowfoot 1957: Pl. XV,43). Abb. 8 (rechts): Didrachme aus Hierapolis, Zeit Alexanders des Großen (LIMC Dea Syria 4).

worden. Die eher steife, frontale Darstellung der thronenden Göttin findet, soweit sich vorläufig feststellen ließ, keine Parallelen in der hellenistischen Miniaturkunst, sondern eher auf Gemmen der römischen Kaiserzeit.[28]

4. Fazit

Die Fundobjekte aus Khirbet Qeiyafa und Dor stehen, abgesehen von der gemeinsamen Konstellation Göttin – Löwe, in keinerlei Verbindung zueinander. Das Skaraboid aus Khirbet Qeiyafa dürfte über die Phönizier ins Binnenland gelangt sein. Es müssen im 4./3. Jh. v.u.Z. Kontakte in den Mittelmeerrraum bestanden haben, wo phönizisch-punische Jaspissiegel verbreitet waren. Auch wenn der beschädigte Kopf der Göttinnengravur keine klare Identifikation zulässt, wirkt doch der Typ der stehenden, schlanken, bekleideten Göttin im Profil ägyptisch beeinflusst und erinnert an Sachmet-Darstellungen. Die Verbindung der Sachmet mit einem schreitenden Löwen als Podesttier ist in der ägyptischen Ikonographie jedoch nicht beheimatet.

Auch das Bronzesiegel aus Dor wartet mit Besonderheiten auf, die in dieser Kombination sonst bislang nicht anzutreffen sind. Es handelt sich am ehesten um eine geflügelte Artemis als Potnia Theron, eine Variante der Artemis-Darstellung, die in Etrurien und Italien im 3. Jh. v.u.Z. häufiger vorkommt. In Palästina/Israel ist zwar der Typ einer Herrin der Löwen noch auf dem berühmten

[28] Vgl. beispielsweise Tassie/Raspe 1791: 80 Nos. 798–799. Auch die Art, wie der Löwe dargestellt wird, ähnelt kaiserzeitlichen Löwenbildern auf Gemmen (vgl. Zazoff 1983: 322 Taf. 96,5). Die auf dem Löwen reitende Kybele ist ähnlich auf Tonlampen römischer Zeit anzutreffen (LIMC Kybele 91–93).

Terrakottaständer aus Taanach[29] aus der Eisenzeit II vertreten, aber da handelt es sich um eine nackte – und ungeflügelte – Göttin, die die Löwen dominiert. Auf dem Siegel aus Dor trägt die Göttin hellenistische Darstellungsmerkmale wie das durchscheinende Gewand, das Aphrodite und auch Nike auszeichnet. Außergewöhnlich ist die Verbindung mit den Löwen, die die Göttin unter ihre Flügel nimmt, aber nicht packt oder hochreißt.

Aus zwei disparaten Funden, die jeweils mit einigen Unsicherheiten behaftet sind, weitreichende Schlüsse zu ziehen, ist nicht angezeigt. Zumindest aber wird man feststellen dürfen, dass die Verbindung von Göttin und Löwen in sehr unterschiedlichen Varianten bis in die hellenistische Zeit (und darüber hinaus) anzutreffen ist. Ob der neueste Fund von gut tausend hellenistischen Bullen in Marescha das Bild komplettiert, bleibt abzuwarten.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Bernisches Historisches Museum (Hg.), 2002, *Die Hydria von Grächwil. Ein griechisches Prunkgefäss aus Tarent*, Bern.

Boardman, John, 1970, *Greek Gems and Finger Rings. Early Bronze Age to Late Classical*, London.

Boardman, John, 1984, *Escarabeos de piedra procedentes de Ibiza*, Madrid.

Collon, Dominique, 1987, *First Impressions. Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East*, London.

Crowfoot, John Winter/Grace Mary Crowfoot/Kathleen Mary Kenyon, 1957, *Samaria — Sebaste. Reports of the Work of the Joint Expedition in 1931–1933 and of the British Expedition in 1935. Vol. 3: The Objects from Samaria*, London.

Herrmann, Christian, 2006, *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel.* Band III (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 24), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Herrmann, Christian/Thomas Staubli, 2010, *1001 Amulett. Altägyptischer Zauber, monotheisierte Talismane, säkulare Magie*, Fribourg/Stuttgart.

Keel, Othmar, 1984, *Deine Blicke sind Tauben. Zur Metaphorik des Hohen Liedes* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 114/115), Stuttgart.

Keel, Othmar, 1992, *Das Recht der Bilder gesehen zu werden. Drei Fallstudien zur Methode der Interpretation altorientalischer Bilder* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 122), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar, 2010, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel*

[29] Schroer 2018: No. 1197.

Eton (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 29), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar/Silvia Schroer, [3]2008, *Schöpfung. Biblische Theologien im Kontext altorientalischer Religionen*, Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar/Christoph Uehlinger, [6]2010, *Göttinnen, Götter und Gottessymbole. Neue Erkenntnisse zur Religionsgeschichte Kanaans und Israels aufgrund bislang unerschlossener ikonographischer Quellen*, Fribourg.

LIMC = Fondation pour le Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae [éd.]. 1981–2009. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 10 Bde. (in 20 Teilen), Zürich/München.

Mazar, Elat, 2015, *The Ophel Excavations to the South of the Temple Mount. 2009–2013. Final Reports Vol. 1*, Jerusalem.

Naumann, Friederike, 1983, *Die Ikonographie der Kybele in der phrygischen und der griechischen Kunst* (IM Beihefte 28), Tübingen.

Schroer, Silvia, 1987, Die Zweiggöttin in Palästina/Israel: Von der Mittelbronze II B-Zeit bis zu Jesus Sirach, in: Max Küchler/Christoph Uehlinger (Hgg.). *Jerusalem. Texte – Bilder – Steine. FS H. und O. Keel-Leu* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 6), Fribourg/Göttingen, 89–207.

Schroer, Silvia, 2008, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient: eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern, Vol. 2: Die Mittelbronzezeit*, Fribourg.

Schroer, Silvia, 2011, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient: eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern, Vol. 3: Die Spätbronzezeit*, Fribourg.

Schroer, Silvia, 2018, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient: eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern, Vol. 4: Die Eisenzeit bis zum Beginn der achämenidischen Herrschaft*, Basel.

Schroer, Silvia/Othmar Keel, 2005, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient: eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern, Vol. 1: Vom ausgehenden Mesolithikum bis zur Frühbronzezeit*, Fribourg.

Schroer, Silvia/Florian Lippke, 2014, Beobachtungen zu den spätpersischen Samaria-Bullen aus dem Wadi ed-Daliyeh. Hellenisches, Persisches und Lokaltraditionen im Grenzgebiet der Provinz Yehud, in: Christian Frevel/Katharina Pyschny/Izak Cornelius (Hgg.), *A „Religious Revolution" in Yehud? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 267), Fribourg/Göttingen, 305–390.

Schroer, Silvia/Patrick Wyssmann, 2012, Eine Göttin auf dem Löwen aus Ḫirbet Qēyafa: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 128, 158–169.

Schroer, Silvia/Patrick Wyssmann, 2018, A Late Phoenician Scaraboid, in: Yosef Garfinkel et al., *Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 4. Excavation Report 2007–2013: Art, Cult, and Epigraphy*, Jerusalem, 333–341.

Stern, Ephraim, 1992, 1994, [2]2000, *Dor. Ruler of the Seas*, Jerusalem.

Stern, Ephraim, 1995, *Excavations at Dor, Final Report, Vol. 1B: Areas A and C: The Finds*, Jerusalem.

Tassie, James/Rudolf Erich Raspe, 1791, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient and Modern Engraved Gems, Cameos as well as Intaglios, Taken from the Most Celebrated Cabinets in Europe and Cast in Coloured Pastes*, London.

Vieweger, Dieter/Jutta Häser, 2007, Das „Gadara-Region Project". Der Tell Zerāʿa in den Jahren 2005 und 2006: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 123, 1–27.

Zazoff, Peter, 1983, *Die antiken Gemmen* (Handbuch der Archäologie), München.

GOD AS A CHILD IN THE SOUTHERN LEVANT AND NORTHERN EGYPT: CULTURAL TRANSITION AND CONTINUITY IN THE LIGHT OF A PICTORIAL MOTIF OF THE *LONGUE DURÉE*

Thomas Staubli

This study reconstructs transitions in the motif of the divine child in visual art in the regions and epochs of the flourishing Levantine-Egyptian koinè. In order to do so, traditional borders of disciplines (text/art, pagan/Christian/Jewish, Greece/Levant/Egypt) are not respected.

The motif, attested since prehistoric times, gained popularity with the Libyan dynasties and was immediately received in the Levant and spread over the whole Mediterranean. It was propagated and transformed in the healing centers of the region. During Ptolemaic reign in Egypt the Hellenized Egyptians and the Egyptianized Greeks transformed the motif of the child-god aesthetically and in regard of its concept. At the same time it was fused with IAÔ, a Jewish re-interpretation of the Canaanite god Baal-Seth. Finally we find its imprints prominently in the Christian religion. For better orientation three main functions of the image of the divine child, as they were developed during the research, may be distinguished: the endangered child (medical relevance), the savior-child (political relevance), and the cosmic child (theological relevance).

1. Transition and the child: Some preliminary remarks

Changes and transitions are normal for Western human beings of the 21st century CE. No wonder, even the climate is changing during their lifetime as a consequence of human actions. In fact, change is needed to get an idea of history. Without change, there is no history. However, during 99% or more of the passed time of human history changes were so rare, that history can only be generated by contracting thousands of years.

Still during the Persian and Early Hellenistic period, which is the focus of this study, changes occurred so slowly that we realize them only if we compare our data with the preceding and the following periods as well. This is especially true for images. Whereas texts are suitable for memorizing names and dates, places, quantities, facts and events, images are more qualified for the representation of appearance, relation and constellation. Hence, the image is more strongly linked to phenomena of the *longue durée* than texts. Nevertheless, it is exactly the affinity to elements of the *longue durée* that make images a valuable

source for the reconstruction of transitions over centuries: The comparison of art motifs from different epochs makes transitions visible.

It is true that during the focus period the Southern Levant and Northern Egypt experienced a dramatic change of rivaling empires on an east-west axis. However, the prevailing economic, political, and cultural exchange between the Levant and Egypt continued during these periods more or less as before. The Egyptian-Levantine koinè is a very well attested cultural factor over many centuries (Mourad 2015 and 2019–21; Staubli 2016) and should be kept in mind in order to understand the transitions properly.

The child as a symbol of the divine experienced a powerful increase in the epochs and regions considered in this article. As far as I can see, there are three aspects of the child that created the premise: Firstly, children were very precious and at the same time much endangered gifts for their parents. The concern for their protection experienced a boom. Second, in the Egyptian cosmological system of symbols, the child has long been a sign of the constantly regenerating course of the sun. And thirdly, the child symbolized the fateful power of man created by God and therefore became an eagerly used, promising sign of a new and just reign, especially in times of political uncertainty.

Due to the religious revolutions happening in the Levant in the period of concern, this essay necessarily also deals with transitions of the concept of the divine child in pagan, Jewish and Christian milieus. Although I study mainly the development and meaning of the relevant pictorial art, I will consider relevant texts as well in order to get a cultural picture that provides a fuller understanding of the amazing popularity of the divine child in Persian, Hellenistic and Roman times.

2. Beginnings of the formation of the symbol of the divine child in Egypt and the Levant

In Egypt, the motif of the (divine) child in art is well known since prehistoric times (Feucht 1984: 401–402). The motif is mentioned in the Pyramid texts (Faulkner 1969: spell 378, §§ 663c and 664a; cf. Meeks 2010: 1). It is said that Horus as a child was not venerated as a distinct deity with a distinct name until the end of the New Kingdom (Sandri 2006: 16). However, the popularity of the motif increases strongly with its close link to the king at the end of the 18th Dynasty. The king as child is explicitly identified by a cartouche on a relief of Ramses II.[1] The same motif is known from a golden amulet of the same period from

[1] Paris, Louvre N 522 (https://collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl010024871, last access: 1 June 2024).



Fig. 1a–k: Amulets and amulet molds of the sun/Horus or Ptah as a child.

Megiddo (**Fig. 1a**). Gold was mainly used to symbolize light. Figurative amulets of child-gods remain popular in the Levant into the Hellenistic period (**Fig. 1b–d**; Herrmann and Staubli 2010: Typen Nr. 1–2; 24; 27–28; 36–37). Attributes of the child are the body proportions, the sidelock and/or the finger in the mouth.

The rising popularity of the divine child in the Ramesside period is obvious from molds from Qantir (19th, 20th dynasties), used to manufacture amulets from faience as a mass product. Beside the classical crouching child with the sidelock and the finger in the mouth (**Fig. 1e–f**), the same motif, protected by a winged uraeus is attested (**Fig. 1g**), the standing child with the sidelock (**Fig. 1h**), and even Horus, dominating snakes and scorpions (**Fig. 1i**), so popular later on the Horus-stelae (see below 3.7). However, sidelock and finger in the mouth, the iconographic elements indicating childhood, are missing in this motif.

From Tell el-Ajjul we have a scarab with a more complex iconography (**Fig. 1j**). The child with the nemes crown is sitting on a bow, a *pars pro toto* for the nine bows, sign of the nine enemies/neighbors of Egypt, as indicated by nine strokes below the bow (Keel and Uehlinger 2010: 90). Fragments of the signs of Menkheperre, throne name of Thutmosis III, in front of the child, can still be seen on the original. Behind the child the title *nṯr nfr*, "perfect god" can be read. The scarab evidently references the motif of the crown prince triumphing over the enemies already as a child. It is known from the private tomb of Kenamun (TT 93; PM I,1,190–194; Schroer 2011: Nr. 638). There Amenophis III, sitting on the knees of a nurse is to be seen with his feet on the nine bows.

Another very popular motif from the Delta region and the Levant was Pataikos, a small, dwarf-like version of Ptah. "He usually has a childish appearance, sometimes with a lock of youth, but may also appear as an adult with a wrinkled forehead and even a beard" (Dasen 2008: 1). Thus, we list him here with an example from Lachish (**Fig. 1k**), indicating that the figure could have been seen as a child but also as a protecting dwarf, similar to Bes. The closeness of Horus the child, Pataikos and Bes is obvious and the amulets of these types had probably a similar function, all around the protection of infants.[2]

The area with the strongest concentration of the motif of the divine child ("Harpocrates") is Lower Egypt. Some popularity is attested for the Hibis Oasis. In Upper Egypt the motif is comparatively rare. In the Levant the motif was very widespread. If we add to this region the findings of Arslan Tash, Deve Hüyük and Nimrud, produced by Levantine artists, those of the Phoenician settlements in the Western Mediterranean (Spain, Sardinia, Italy, and Carthage), and those of Cyprus, then Canaan or the Levant is the area which can claim the highest popularity of the divine child in its artistic craft (cf. **Tab. 1**).

3. A SUCCESSFUL CONSTELLATION: THE SUN-CHILD ON THE LOTUS

A variant of the divine child which gained more and more importance over the centuries is the child on the lotus. Gods on plants are known since the Old Kingdom. However, the cosmogonic representation of the nightly sun-god with the ram's head on the lotus flower doesn't appear before the New Kingdom, as Schlögl (1977) has shown. It is attested under Seti I for the first time, thus, in a time of close cultural contacts with the Levant. The head on the lotus flower from Tut-

[2] The origin of amulets in the realm of mothers, babies and children has been documented by Dubiel 2008. In the Egyptian magic therapy of infants the mother or any other therapist represents Isis and the infant is Horus, according to the "Spells for mother and infant" (pBerlin 3027) spell D (II 6–10) of the late Hyksos period, using material of earlier epochs (cf. Dubiel 2008: 74; Yamazaki 2003: 16–17; Wiese 1996: 130; Borghouts 1994: 129–130).



Tab. 1: Places with finds of Harpocrates according to Meeks 2010. His catalogue offers 224 objects, 183 of which with a provenience (region or place). Note, that the amulet molds of Qantir are not included in his catalogue.

ankhamun's grave can be seen as a forerunner. At the same time, the image of the Horus children, an embodiment of the regenerated viscera of the mummy,



Fig. 2a–b: Pendant recto and verso from Abu Gurob (?), 19th–24th Dynasty.

appears on the lotus. The king as sun-child is probably for the first time visible on a golden pendant from the times of Ramses II (after Schlögl 1977: 19; **Fig. 2**) or the Second Intermediate Period.

The child represents the regenerated king. It works as a symbolic parallelism to the scarab. A hymn from the solar sanctuaries of the New Kingdom ends with the sentence (after Assmann 1975: 20.42–45): "The people rejoice when they see him / the people give him an ovation / in his (cultic) role of the 'child'. Coming out of Re as Chepre." In a hymn from the Book of the Dead from Nakhtamun (19th Dynasty) Re is expressly welcomed in the image of the child on the lotus (after Assmann 1975: 43.1–4): "Hail t(o you), boy on the lap, / child, which rises in the lotus flower; / beautiful youth, who comes from the land of light, and brightens [the two countries] with his light." Note that here the lotus flower stands in parallel to the womb (of the mother) and the land of light. Thus, it embodies the presupposition of life at the moment of its creation: no birth without maternal womb, no sunrise without light or twilight. The light aspect is also emphasized in the "Prayer of an Unjustly Persecuted" (20th Dynasty; after Assmann 1975: 192.9–12): "Big lotus flower that appeared in the primeval waters, / you child of the Methyer![3] / Who created the light and drove out the darkness, as the earth lay in cloudy mist." According to these verses the child is not a messenger from the land of light as in the Book of the Dead from the 19th Dynasty. It appears as a creating power itself and a fighter against darkness. The formulation comes close to Gen 1:2–3, where it is said that a wind from God swept over the primordial darkness and watery deep and that God's voice created the light. Darkness and light are oppositions in both texts. The lotus, Methyer and the wind from God are mysterious beings or elements, linking the primordial waters with the realm of life. The child and God's voice are symbols of the powers that create the light (cf. **Tab. 2**).

[3] "The great flood" in the image of a cow.

Actors/elements	*Prayer of an Unjustly Persecuted 9–12*	*Genesis 1:2–3*
primeval state	darkness, waters	darkness, deep and waters
mysterious creative potency	lotus, Methyer	wind from God
visible/audible symbol of the creative act	child	voice of God
new element in opposition to primeval state	light	light

Tab. 2: Creative potency and act adding a new element to a primeval state in an Egyptian Prayer and in a Hebrew myth.

With the so-called Second Intermediate Period the motif of the child-god became more and more popular. Marie-Ange Bonhême and Annie Forgeau[4] raised the hypothesis that the priests of Amun of the 21st Dynasty developed the cult of the local child-god Chons as a counterweight to the power of the Pharaos residing in the Delta. The model of this kind of religion in which the child-god substitutes the child-king was so successful that it was adapted in other cities, especially in Dendera.

However, the motif of the divine child on the lotus flower became even more popular with the Libyan Dynasties of the Delta (Fazzini 1988: 8–10; Hill 2014: 157–159). It is part of a pair of gold cuff bracelets (**Fig. 3**), once belonging to general Nimlot or Nemareth, son of Sheshonq I, "commander of the entire army", also holding the title "king's son of Ramses"[5]. The divine character of the child is indicated by its crook-shaped scepter, the uraeus on its forehead, and the lunar crescent and disk above its head. It is sitting on a blue lotus, emerging from the primordial ocean, from which the sun rises daily, thus a symbol of permanent recreation.

A talisman of Osorkon, great chief of the Meshwesh (**Fig. 4**) – a tribe who settled the Eastern Delta starting from the second part of the 12th century BCE – shows the child in a shen-ring, with crook-shaped scepter sitting on a lotus flower, and the uraeus-flanked sun disk over his head. It is protected by two winged uraei with shen-rings. The child represents the sun-like, splendid aspect of royal governance, if we assume that Re-Harachte, master of heavens, quoted in the inscription speaks to the king, saying among else: "…your radiance may be inside of the two countries" (after Moje 2014: 256).

The Eastern Delta was a region of intensive migration and as a consequence, with a mixed population. Given the fact, that Levantine artistic crafts were present in Egypt over centuries, as for instance recently documented for the gold

[4] Bonhême and Forgeau 1988: 93–96.
[5] Cf. Jansen-Winkeln 2006: 300–301.



Fig. 3: Pair of bracelet from Tanis, ca. 940 BCE (22nd Dynasty).

Fig. 4: Amulet from the Eastern Delta, ca. 800–740 BCE.

decors on objects from the tomb of Tutankhamun (Bertsch, Broschat, and Eckmann 2017), I would not exclude the possibility that the motif of Horpakhered on the lotus flower was developed by Levantine artists in Egypt.

4. Media of the godly child in the Levantine world

However that may have been, the successful motif immediately moved north. Together with other representations of the divine child it is well attested in the local art on different media: ivories, silver bowls, stamp seal amulets, bronze figures, reliefs, coins, and stela.

4.1. *The sun-child on ivories*

The child on the lotus is attested three times among the ivories from Samaria (**Fig. 5a–c**). It is the most frequent motif among the local ivories. The most complete item (**Fig. 5a**)[6] displays the child in the blossom, crowned by the Hemhem-crown, richly decorated with colored insets and gold foil. Compared to the above presented items from the Delta, there is a certain emphasis on the blossom, protecting the child with big petals. This seems to be a Levantine trait, since plants in the form of trees, branches and flowers are the main motif of life and regeneration in Levantine art (Staubli 2014a and 2014b). The traces of a big petal are also discernible on a fragment of the motif (**Fig. 5b**). A further fragment shows the deity on the lotus together with the falcon-headed being representing a divine figure (**Fig. 5c**). Maybe the falcon-headed deity here adopts the role

[6] Nevertheless, even this plaque was not fully preserved. Some drawings of the item render the reconstruction by Crowfoot and Crowfoot 1938: Pl. 1,1; frontispiece and not the preserved original (for instance Schroer 2018: Nr. 1431).



Fig. 5a–c: Ivories from Samaria, ca. 800–722 BCE.

of Re-Harachte from **Fig. 4**. Furthermore, among the ostraca from Samaria we find the name *ʾnmš*, "the beautiful one is on the pond", maybe an epitheton of Horus on the blossom (Keel and Uehlinger 2010: 232).

The motif is also attested in a Phoenician style among the ivories of Nimrud, and Arslan Tash[7] around 800 BCE. In both cases the infant holds the flagellum of Osiris. It is crowned either by the Atef-crown or by the sun disk. On a fragmentary ivory from Nimrud[8], the child on the blossom, protected by two winged goddesses, is wrapped in mummy bandages, thus representing Horus and Osiris, sunrise and sunset, at the same time. Furthermore, this representation stands in parallel with the veneration of a sacred tree by two noble persons, thus being further evidence for the above-mentioned Levantine high estimation of vegetal motifs.

4.2. *The sun-child on silver bowls*

The parallelism of the child and the sacred tree is also to be found on a silver bowl from Amathus (**Fig. 6a**). To the right of the veneration of a sacred tree we see the sun child seated on a lotus, with a flail on its shoulder and finger to its mouth, facing a winged goddess with Isis-sign (?) who extends a lotus in either hand. Then follows a winged scarab supporting a solar disk, flanked by kneeling figures of Re-Harakhte. To the left of the venerated tree we see the standing Horus with finger to mouth and an ankh in his left hand in front of a winged

[7] Barnett 1982: 48, Pl. 47c; Moscati 1988: 524; Meeks 2010: Nr. 187.

[8] BM WAA 118264 and WAA 126555; supplementary drawing in Barnett ²1975: Taf. XXXII = Hölbl 1989: Abb. 7.

Fig. 6a–b: Silver bowls from Amathus and Praeneste (Tomba Bernardini), 8th century BCE.

goddess with the Hathor-crown, extending Maat-feathers in her hands. Then follows again the winged scarab, flanked by Re-Harakhte as on the right side. The composition fills the middle register of the bowl. While the outer register shows the siege of a city and the destruction of its orchards, the inner register is decorated with sphinxes, crowned by a sun-disc which is protected by a serpent. The innermost circle is decorated by a rosette. The complexity of the whole setting permits to draw some iconological conclusions. The sun-child belongs to the sphere of permanently renewing life, represented by growing vegetation, the rising sun – both of them venerated, that is, cultic icons –, children growing up, care and protection (goddesses). This sphere is contrasted by the sphere of chaos, represented by war and by the sphere of God, the central rosette which is surrounded by (probably 7!) hybrids indicating God's presence. The iconographic syntax of the décor emphasizes the city and the sacred tree which are in the center of the axisymmetric composition and the rosette in the center of the point-symmetric composition. The child, together with its protective deities, is emphasized in a different way. It's the only iconographic element which is repeated in a parallelism with modified elements (feather/lotus, Hathor/Isis, standing/squatting). Eventually, the child on the flower is the most dynamic iconem in itself as it governs death (flail) by eternal rebirthing (lotus).

On a silver bowl from the *Tomba Bernardini* in Praeneste (**Fig. 6b**) two sun children in a bark,[9] squatting on a lotus, both of them protected by a falcon, are flanking a double winged scarab with a sun disk, forming the center of the composition. The bark is one of four, each of them with a different iconographic setting arranged around a central scene with the smiting pharaoh. In between the four different barks four identical scenes of Isis, nursing Horus in the thicket of Chemmis are arranged. The fine artwork has Egyptian inscriptions and a Phoenician dedication.

4.3. *The divine child on amulets*

From the vicinity of Tyre comes an amulet in the form of a writing-tablet, typical for the 26th Dynasty (**Fig. 7**). This shows the sun-child on the lotus in front of a snake or scorpion on one side of the amulet. On the obverse there is a scene probably depicting Isis with Horus in the papyrus thicket and an associated inscription of two words in two lines, reading "watch over/guard" (*šmr/nṣr*; Schmitz 2002: 822). It is the beginning of a petition for divine protection.

The sun-child is well attested on stamp seals from the Levant and the Nile Delta, not to speak here of those from Sardinia, where the divine child was an

[9] An ivory plaque from the tomba Bernardini (Inv. Nr. 61761) shows a bark scene as well. It is a rare adoption in Etruscan art (Clark 2007: 51–52 with cat. 149).



Fig. 7: Amulet from the vicinity of Tyre, ca. 26th Dynasty (664–525 BCE). The personal name and patronymic which should follow on the next lines is missing or at least not readable on the published photograph.

especially prominent motif.[10] The simplest types on seals show only the crouching child with different crowns, the double crown (**Fig. 8a**) or the Hemhem-crown (**Fig. 8b–c**). In this simple variant the image is also readable as *pr*, "to become, to grow". More frequent is the child on the lotus. However, this combination is rarely to be found without further elements as on a scarab from Akko (**Fig. 8d**). The child on the lotus is mostly combined with further symbols. On a scarab from Amrit (**Fig. 8e**) the child on the lotus appears upon a *nb*-sign, protected by an uraeus. Sometimes the child is protected by falcons (**Fig. 8f and j**) or by its mother Isis (**Fig. 8k–l**) or women from Isis' realm (**Fig. 8i**), or it is flanked by venerators (**Fig. 8g–h**).[11] The motif is well attested on name seals (**Fig. 8f–g**).[12] Complex scenes associate Harpocrates with the papyrus-thicket of the Nile (**Fig. 8i**), the Memphite gods Mut (**Fig. 8i**) and Ptah (**Fig. 8j**), and the triad of Abydos (Osiris, Isis, Horus; **Fig. 8k–l**). It is noteworthy that Osiris in the triad of the seal from Amrit (**Fig. 8k**) is displayed in the pose of the child as well and both figures are enthroned. Furthermore, the triad is combined with an ibex, a typically Levantine motif. In contrast to this seal, Osiris and the Horus-child on **Fig. 8l** are standing and the triad is flanked by a *nbw*-sign below and a sun in the bark above. A unique variant of the lotus-Horus-constellation is the inscription *lpšḥr*, "belonging to Pashḥur" in ancient Hebrew between a lotus, flanked by two rosettes, and a sun-disc with arrows (?) on **Fig. 8m**. Pashḥur is the hebraicised Egyptian name *p3 šrj (n) Ḥr*, "child of Horus". By combining his

[10] Hölbl 1986: 272–291 in his rubric "scarabs of hard stone" (mainly Jaspis) lists a total of 78 items of "Harpocrates": 27 on the lotus (or stilized papyrus), 7 of them flanked by goddesses; 22 without lotus, 29 with the child nursed by his mother.

[11] As for 8g, cf. the interpretation of Keel and Uehlinger [6]2010: 156 referring to Abb. 160.

[12] For parallels on name seals see Avigad and Sass 1997: Nr. 175, 316, 712, 733, 1121.

Fig. 8a–m: The divine child on seal amulets.

name with a lotus and a sun-motif the owner of the seal follows Egyptian traditions. At the same time the son of Egyptian immigrants respects the Judean aversion to anthropomorphic and theriomorphic images of deities. Egyptian immigrants were supposed to be integrated in the Yahwe-community of Israel in the third generation (Deut 23:9).

4.4. *Child-gods in bronze*

While scarabs disappear continually during the first millennium BCE, bronze figures are more and more popular. The catalogue of bronze figures of gods and animals from Lower Egypt by Katja Weiss offers 263 child gods out of a total of 1781 collected figures, that is 15% of the bronzes. According to Weiss the 29 different types of child-gods (her types 41–69) represent the most popular types of the 151 different types of human (or hybrid) bronze figures listed by her (cf. Weiss 2012: 59–66).

The hotspots for the veneration of Harpocrates were evidently Memphis/Saqqara and Athribis, where most of the figurines have been found (**Tab. 3**). A venerated deity was mostly represented by different types as was the case for Harpocrates of Athribis (Weiss 2012: 461–462). The same is true for Harpocrates of Ashkelon (see excursus below).

The popularity of the motif demonstrates that the child-god functioned not only as a legitimating figure for (new) kings but also as a blessing deity for children. This is also confirmed by the still existing and readable dedication inscriptions on some of the figurine's pedestals. The repetitive formula is "…the one who gives life…" (*...dj 'nḫ...*)[13]. Once the child-god holds even the title "master of nourishment" (*nb k3*)[14]. Another title is "son of Amun"[15], another one "the one who is in Mendes"[16]. The most complete inscription reads: "Harpocrates, the great god, the one who is in Athribis, the one who spends life to Pa-en-ka-ruj, son of the keeper of the garments and to the initiate of Sechet-hotep Takelot, born by the lady of the house (Ta)-di(t)-Hor and Ta-ni(t)-Hor, daughter of the 'prophet of Athribis, Hori.'"[17] The name of the daughter Tanit-Hor reveals a partly Phoenician background of the dedicators.

Horus the child, being a figure of the Egyptian-Levantine koine, is illustrated at its best by a bronze statuette of unknown origin in the British Museum, providing a fragmentary bilingual inscription (**Fig. 9a**). On the right side of the base an inscription written with hieroglyphs reads: "May Harpocrates grant life to Us-ankh, son of Pet-hy…" On the three other sides of the base a Phoenician inscription reads: "(front) May Harpocrates grant (left side) life to Amos, son of Eshmunyaton, son of (back side) Azarmilk! And NN, the architect wrote (it)."[18]

[13] Cf. Weiss 2012: Nr. 186, 217, 220, 234, 238, 239, 241, 248, 250, 251, 252, 254, 278, 279, 282, 283, 307, 309, 310, 316, 317, 319, 332, 338, 345, 349, 352, 354, 358.

[14] Weiss 2012: Nr. 307.

[15] Weiss 2012: Nr. 349.

[16] Weiss 2012: Nr. 352.

[17] Weiss 2012: Nr. 278.

[18] Translation according to Ferron 1974: 80; earlier publications Aimé-Giron 1924: 4; Barnett 1963–64.



Tab. 3: Find locations of child-gods in bronze in the Egyptian delta region (according to Weiss 2012).

Fig. 9a–b: Bronze statuettes from Egypt/Phoenicia, 6th–4th century BCE.

As already suggested by Barnett, the two names represent one and the same person "who was evidently known differently among the Egyptians and among his kith and kin" (Barnett 1963–64: 85). According to him Harpocrates was not part of the normal local pantheon. He explains the statuette with the closeness of the the cults of Isis and Horus, and Astarte and her lover Tammuz at Byblos. But this explanation is strange, for Harpocrates is a child and not a lover. Furthermore, the image of the child is much older than any mythological narration. Horus the child and Chons the child for instance are identical from an iconic point of view. The names are secondary and do not really help much to understand the image. Rather the image helps to clarify the function of a deity. In the case of the child it emphasizes its forces of recreation, the potential of youthfulness, implying optimism, renewal, and growth. However, in this case the figure was explicitly identified with Harpocrates which means that this name was familiar to the Phoenicians and did not need any further acculturation into a so-called local cult. Ferron (1974: 94) believes that the figure was a burial object expressing the hope of rebirth as a symbol of the rising sun. According to him the object was probably produced in Egypt where it was used by a family of Levantine or Carthaginian origin. In other words: The Egyptian way to depict a royal or divine child became so widespread in the Eastern Mediterranean, that it was not perceived

as foreign imagery and was not necessarily connected with a larger Isiac mythology. It was an independently understandable and usable image, at least among Levantines and Carthaginians.[19]

A contemporary parallel from the Archeological Museum of Madrid of a Harpocrates with a double crown (**Fig. 9b**) has a Canaanite inscription on all sides of the pedestal which reads: "(front side) May Harpocrates grant life to (left side) his servant Abdeshmun, son of Ashtartjaton, son of Magon, son of Khantes, (back side) son of Peṭ, son of Ṭeṭ, son of Pashmeḥy! (right side) Written by Matanṣid."[20] This time the Levantine-Egyptian koine is attested by the genealogy of Abdeshmun to whom the figurine has been dedicated. While his father and grandfather have Carthaginian names,[21] the former ancestors have Egyptian names and the writer of the dedication has a Canaanite name.

4.5. *Excursus: The divine child and the healing center of Ashkelon (Ascalon)*

A unique window into the world where Harpocrates was venerated in the ancient Levant was opened by a bronze hoard. In a context with pottery from the 5th to the 2nd century BCE 23 bronze objects have been found in Ashkelon (Iliffe 1936). Seven figures represent Harpocrates, seven Osiris, three Apis, two Isis nursing the Horus child, one Anubis, one Bastet, one a solar deity, one an ibis, and one a serpent-headed god. In sum, Horus as a child is represented nine times and hence the star of the pantheon of the hoard. Each of the Harpocrates figures has a different shape (**Tab. 4**).

The Eshmun-sanctuary of Bostan esh-Sheikh near Sidon which formed the center of a sanatorium was gifted with a large number of precious votive statues in the shape of children (Stucky 1993). Maybe the significance of Harpocrates in Ashkelon must be understood in a similar context. The more than 1400 dog burials from a period of about eighty years, dated to the last half of the 5th century and the beginning of the 4th century BCE in Ashkelon suggest that the city was a place where dogs were used in healing or purifying rituals (Edrey 2008, following Stager 1991). The ancient Canaanite healing-god Reshef (or Mekal), followed in Sidon by Eshmun respectively Apollo, seems to have been followed by Serapis in Ashkelon. Astarte, the city goddess, was identified by Herodot (I, 105.2–3) as Aphrodite Ourania. Similarly, the Near Eastern goddess is called Aphrodite on city coins from Eryx and Segesta in Sicily where she is represented

[19] For Carthaginian funerary stela see Ferron 1973.

[20] Translation according to Ferron 1971: 363. A similar dedication is to be found on a situla in the Museum of Art at Princeton University (1938.32): "May Isis grant favor and life to Abdi-Ptah, son of Abdo!" (Amadasi Guzzo 1996: 1047 following McCarter Jr. 1993)

[21] The name Magon is known from the genealogy of Hannibal (Beloch 1923: 120).

	Inventary number	*Description*	*Type Weiss*	*Type Meeks*
1	33.2776	Fragment. Pierced ears, inlaid eyes, hole for the lock of hair (missing) and uraeus (missing).	45 (?)	1.1.
2	33.2777	Seated Horpakhered. Double crown, finger at the mouth, uraeus, sitting. Loop at the back for attachment; remains of a prong for insertion into a socket.	51	2.2.
3	33.2778	Seated Horpakhered. Arms and hands outspread. Lock of hair and uraeus. Incised collar around the shoulders.	42	1.1.2.
4	34.30	As Nr. 3 but without uraeus and collar. Lock broken away.	42	1.1.2.
5	34.29	As Nr. 3 but with lunar disc. Big navel. Intact with peg below the pedestal remains.	65	1.3.
6	33.2779	As Nr. 3 but without uraeus, accentuated sex. Circular loop for attachment.	42	1.1.2.
7	34.33	As Nr. 6 but wearing a wig coming down over his shoulders and over it the lock of hair. Unusual.	-	10

Tab. 4: Harpocrates figures in the hoard of Ashkelon with typology of Weiss 2012 and Meeks 2010.

together with a dog on the reverse (Heltzer 1998). However, in Ashkelon where Astarte also was venerated as Phanebal, the face of Baal, the goddess was identified with Isis. The healing forces of Isis in ancient Egypt are well known. She was the great goddess of medicine (Allen 2005). In the context of a sanatorium or hospital the divine child represented the endangered and saved child, protected and blessed by God. For the parents it was a symbol of the ongoing life of the family. Thus, the *Sitz im Leben* of the cult of Harpocrates in Ashkelon could have been the Serapeion whose location probably is remembered in the name of Khirbet esh-Sheraf, five kilometers south of Ashkelon.[22]

[22] "Zerifa in Ashkelon" one of five temples of idol worship mentioned in Avoda Zara 11b, is widely believed to be the Serapeion of Ashkelon. The location of the Serapeion in Khirbet esh-Sheraf was proposed by Avi-Yonah 1940: 19, followed by Safrai 1984: 152. Dvorjetski (1994) thinks that "Zerifa in Ashkelon" was at once a temple of Phanebal and a metal workshop for idolatry. Fuks (2000: n. 136), following Efron 1990, remains sceptic about that.

Fig. 10: Fragment of Sculptor's model from Tell Nabasha, early 3rd century BCE.

4.6. *The child-god on a sculptor's model*

On Tell Nabasha (Nielsen, Gasperini, and Mamedow 2016) in the Northeastern Delta region in the context of a Late Period-Ptolemaic place recently a sculptor's model of Harpocrates has been found (**Fig. 10**). The excavations unearthed also three Persian riders, two female plaque figurines, and three faience amulets: two *wadjet* eyes and an Ibis-headed Thot. The few items of imported ware among the ceramic finds are from Greece (transport amphorae and fine ware) and the Levant (Torpedo jars).

The outstanding find of the sculptor's model in a modest place with some relations to the Southern Levant and the Aegean is another proof of the high popularity of the child god in the region at the time. Was the place the home of sculptors who worked for the decoration of temples in the region? Few other sculptor's models are known with the motif of a child god. On a limestone from Tanis (30th Dynasty; Tomoum 2005: cat. 86b–c) the standing deity is associated with a frontal and a side head of Bes on the back side. On a limestone from Edfu (30th Dynasty; Tomoum 2005: cat. 87, Pl. 87a–b) the standing deity is associated with the queen, decorated with the vulture's crown on the back side. On another limestone from Edfu (31st Dynasty; Tomoum 2005: cat. 193, Pl. 95a–b) the walking child god with a sistrum in his right and a flagellum in his left hand is associated with a striding lion on the back side. Furthermore, this piece provides a demotic inscription with the short biography of an unnamed priest (Tamoum 2005: 117). The dating of his life refers to the Greek and to the Persian authority as well.

Thus it is obvious that the divine child is associated with protecting figures (mother, Bes, lion sc. Sachmet) and could represent and remember a deceased person.

4.7. *Harpocrates on Southern-Levantine coinage*

The Isiatic family is represented in nine of the approximately thirty cities that struck coins during the Roman period in the provinces of Judea, Samaria, and the Galilee, as shown by Laurent Bricault. Rightly she states that "it was the traditional Egyptian cults of Isis with Osiris and Horus which spread to this part of the Mediterranean and not the Hellenized Isiatic cults of Isis with Serapis and Harpocrates" (Bricault 2006: 132). Members of the triad are represented on Samarian coins from Caesarea, Diospolis, and Neapolis, on Judean coins from Aelia Capitolina, Ashkelon, Eleutheropolis and Raphia, on Galileean coins from Tiberias and on Phoenician coins from Akko-Ptolemais. Serapis is dominant, Isis rare (only attested in Akko-Ptolemais). Harpocrates is to be found on coins from Akko-Ptolemais, Raphia and especially from Ashkelon. In a unique iconographic setting he is standing on three lions, wearing the *hemhem*-crown, and holding the flagellum and a scepter in his hands, while the iconographic elements of childhood (finger in the mouth and side-lock) are missing or not visible. Palistrant Shaicks interprets the lions as solar symbols (Palistrant Shaicks 2012: 135–136). However, given the fact that the figure is dominating the animals and that Asclepius of Ashkelon was famous as Leontouchos, "the one who holds the lions",[23] still in the 5th century CE, Barnett may be right in interpreting the figure as Asclepius and as a heritage of Reshef, respectively Eshmun Shedrafa ("Shed who heals"; see below 4.8), the healing god of the region (Barnett 1985: 27).[24]

Maybe Harpocrates is shown on a pilaster from Ashkelon, behind Isis, as a standing figure with a diadem, decorated with a star. Alternatively the figure is also interpreted as a priest or a prince (Krug 1995; Bricault 2006: 130).

Given the importance of Harpocrates in the bronze hoard of Ashkelon (see excursus above; not mentioned by Bricault 2006 and Palistrant Shaicks 2012) from the Persian period, the conclusion seems reasonable that he was venerated in this city as a main aspect of God over more than 800 years. The apodictic statement of Gideon Fuks (2000: 41) that "because of the destruction of Philistine-Canaanite Ashkelon in 604 BCE, no connection should be drawn between these statuettes and the reappearance on the scene of Isis and Osiris during the Hellenistic period" is not justified. On the contrary, the histories of the cults of the Levantine cities as far as they are known, demonstrate, that the colonial

[23] Marinus writes in his Vita Procli 19 that Proclus wrote a hymn in honor of "Asclepius Leontouchos of Ashkelon."

[24] A Shed-stela of the 22nd/23rd Dynasties, probably from Karnak, today in Boston (Museum of fine arts 05.90), shows the child-deity as a warrior in a chariot driven by sphinxes, fighting the evils in form of animals, among them is a lion (Sternberg-El Hotabi 1989: 282). Shed/Harpocrates as savior in the chariot is still known in Hellenistic-Roman times (Sternberg-El Hotabi 1989: n. 4).

invasions – be they Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian or Roman – did not lead to a total cultural break. Even in the case of Samaria and Jerusalem, where the deportation of the ruling class by the Assyrian and Babylonian army is well documented in the literary heritage of those city states, the ancient cults continued in renewed forms. This is even more true for the cults with Egyptian origin in the coastal cities, forming a cultural continuum of the region at least since the 3rd millennium BCE. The Egyptian forms of the representation of God became a Levantine character. They are an expression of the strong economical and cultural relationships with Egypt and not necessarily of an Egyptian hegemony, for also Canaanite shapes of deities are well attested in Northern Egypt. The situation in the Levant differs significantly from the situation in the western part of the Mediterranean, where the Isiac family did not appear before the middle of the 1st century BCE. The earliest traces are detectable in the Libyan town of Sabratha (Bricault, Le Bohec, and Podvin 2004).

4.8. *Shed/Shaddai (?) or Horus/Iaô on the so called Horus-stelae*

Horpakhered/Harpocrates is not the only Egyptian child-god with strong Levantine connections. Immediately after the Amarna period a new deity appears in Egypt in the field of popular religion, called Shed. It is attested in the realm of the highly skilled workers in Deir el-Medineh and in the publicly accessible courtyards of the great Amun temple of Karnak. Whether it is an appropriation of the Semitic god Shaddai (Loukianoff 1930–31), is controversial. It is certain that Shed with the gazelle head and the lance and the crossed dress has un-Egyptian attributes that are also known from the Levantine god Reshef, that he can be connected iconographically also with the Levantine god Hauron or the Levantine goddess Qudschu, and that among the portrayed worshipers of Shed we find over centuries people with Levantine dresses. It is also certain that the deity was rapidly gaining popularity under the Ramessides, in a context of burgeoning personal piety. The deity is associated with Horus, Isis and Osiris and at the same time remains open to the development of an all-encompassing all-deity. Its name could be interpreted by Egyptians as "savior" (Sternberg-El Hotabi 1999: 21–70). Given the closeness of the sun-child and Iaô on the gems (see below 5.4) an identification of the Horus-child on the stelae with Iaô/YHWH by Egyptian Judeans can not be excluded.

The heyday of the Horus-stelae was the Ptolemaic time and the early Roman Empire; 70% of the known material stems from that period. Many stelae from that time show abraded faces of Horus, thus attesting their magical use. Sternberg-El Hotabi also demonstrated that starting with the 2nd century BCE the hieroglyphs on the stelae were no more understood but still used as pseudo-

script.[25] In other words, the iconic aspect of Horus as a child was dominant. Two Horus-stelae have been found out of Egypt, one in Byblos (ca. 380–280 BCE; Sternberg-El-Hotabi 1999: Bd. II, 18) and one in Hama (ca. 164–61 BCE; Sternberg-El Hotabi 1999: Bd. II, 47).

5. Cultural and Religious transformations of the child

Egypt's sensibility for icons was outstanding. The neighbors were fascinated by the Egyptian visual forms. The genesis of the alphabet illustrates how such forms were used by people from the Levant to develop an easy writing system for their own languages. Similar processes occurred in what we call art history. The Egyptian form of the Horus-child was filled with diverse, sometimes new contents when received in the multicultural milieus of the Nile Delta and beyond. Some of these transformations will be illustrated and discussed in the following paragraphs.

5.1. *The meaning of Horus, the child according to the Metternich stela*

Evidently the protecting power of the divine child is dominant in the case of the amulets and of the so called Horus-stelae as well. In order to understand this popular aspect of Horus, a famous monument of Persian times may be helpful. Horus is the central figure of the so called Metternich stela, a kind of mega Horus-stela, from the reign of Nectanebo II (360–343 BCE), found in Alexandria, since 1950 in the Metropolitan Museum (Fletcher Fund, 50.85). According to the text on the stela,[26] "Horus, young and golden, a helpless and fatherless child" is found by his mother "the vessels of his body not beating." The mother is helped by a trustworthy "woman wise in her town". She, herself also a personification of Isis, states: "Horus has been bitten" by a scorpion or a jealous snake. Together with Nephthys she laments until a strike in the crew of the Sun's boat happens. Thot arrives, saying, that "darkness has happened and sunlight is repelled until Horus gets well for his mother Isis – and every man who is suffering as well." He situates Horus's protecting forces at once in the divine child and in its divine entourage: "Horus's protection is his own identity, which the gods serve by aiding him – and the protection of the afflicted as well." In one of his spells Thot ascribes the mighty power to all parts of Horus's body, enabled to fight the potential dangers. The spell on the feet e.g. reminds the

[25] A similar phenomenon is attested for the Levantine scarabs of the 18th–16th century BCE, imitating Egyptian patterns.

[26] All quotes according to the translation of Allen 2005.

famous image of the nine bows under the king's feet: "You have your feet, Horus: The Nine Bows have been spread fallen under your feet, for you have managed the south, the north, the west, and the east." However, Thot's spells are in fact the words of Horus himself and Thot himself is nothing but an admirer and helper of Horus: "Greetings, god, son of a god! Greetings, heir, son of an heir! Greetings, bull, son of a bull, to whom a divine vulva gave birth! Greetings, Horus, who came from Osiris, to whom divine Isis gave birth! I have recited with your magic, I have spoken with your effectiveness, I have enchanted with your words that your mind created…" Horus is at once the savior – "I am Horus the Savior" – and the sufferer. The suffering Horus stands in the center of those accounts and spells where Isis, supported by other goddesses, is the main figure. "Oh, may the child live and the poison die: then Horus will become healthy for his mother Isis, everyone who is suffering will become healthy as well." The king by whom the Metternich stela has been dedicated is addressed twice on the stela by connecting his destiny with that of Horus: "Young god Senedjemibre-Setepenamun, the Sun's son Nectanebo, your protection is that of Horus the Savior, the great god, and vice versa." The same may work for all who trust in Horus and identify themselves with his image.

The texts on the stela quote both, spells and accounts. They evoke the self-healing forces of the baby or child as well as the medicine of the wise women and the male physicians, and the wisdom of divine and cosmic order as an alliance of mighty forces in the battle against the evil powers afflicting the suffering being.

Healing is a main function of Serapis as well, volubly described by the Greek philosopher and rhetor of the 3rd century CE Demetrios of Phaleron in five books (Zivie-Coche and Dunand 2013: 206).

5.2. *Harpocrates during the Hellenistic-Roman period in Egypt*

During the Ptolemaic period the Greek technique of the industrial production of terracotta figures from molds became very popular in Egypt. Among the rich variety of types, images of Harpocrates are by far the most common (Dunand 1990: Nr. 107–324; Zivie-Coche and Dunand 2013: 586).[27] Often they resemble genre scenes which were so popular in Greece, but they contain a religious meaning also.

In the Greco-Roman context the original imagery and meaning of Harpocrates changes strongly. Double crown (*sḫmtj*; gr. *pschent*), crosier (*ḥq3t*), and whip

[27] 218 out of a total of 494 figures from the collections of the Louvre (= 44%) and 195 figures out of a total of 450 figures from the collections of the museum of Cairo (= 43%); cf. Rondot 2013: 253 n. 83 and already Nachtergael 1991.

(*nḫ3ḫ3*) disappear with time (Stefana 2013). Furthermore, Greeks and Romans interpreted the finger on the mouth of the child god as a gesture of silencing. This interpretation is first mentioned by Varron (The Latin language V,57), followed by Ovid (Metamorphoses IX, 692) and Catullus (Poems 74), by Plutarch (Isis and Osiris 68), and later by Augustine (De civitate Dei XVIII,5). Harpocrates even got the name "Sigalion Aegyptius", from the Greek *sigê*, "silence" (Ausonius, ep. 25,27). The Classic interpretation of the gesture was followed by many scholars and artists of the Renaissance and later on (Matthey 2011). The Greco-Roman interpretation of the image of the oriental child-god is an eminent case of iconatrophie, that is of a re-interpretation of an image, based on its misunderstanding (Keesling 2005). However, as Matthey (2011: 556) rightly states, this interpretation has in a Roman context a *fundamentum in re* insofar as the "child", *infans*, participle from *for, fari, fatus*, "to speak", is in Latin by definition "the one who does not speak".

On the other hand, Harpocrates is now equipped with elements of Greek gods. The god could be identified or associated with Heracles (Quaegebeur 1987), Eros, Helios or Apollo, and with the Good Demon in the shape of a snake (Merkelbach 1995: §§155–163). Horos-Herakliskos was the adaption of the image of the Horus-stelae, that is the child dominating every danger represented as snake, scorpion or crocodile. Harpocrates-Eros translates the creative forces of Harpocrates representing the charming power of every beginning, mainly the beginning of every day and the primordial beginning with the first light. Harpocrates-Helios and Horos-Apollo are Greco-Roman translations of the different ages of the sun-god in Egypt, being a child in the morning, an adult at noon time and an old man in the evening. Harpocrates-Dionysos is evoked by the association of the child with grapes, the decoration with a miter, or by a funerary context (Rondot 2013: 247–251 following Lafaye 1900). Harpocrates was furthermore grecized by the Dionysic inspired transformation of his name to Karpokrates with the meaning "Lord of the harvest" (Merkelbach 1995: §153).

The child has divinatory abilities, a quality difficult to be visualized. It is an important aspect of the child in a demotic text (pWien D. 12006r) which probably originated in the 4th century BCE, but is best preserved on a fragment from the 1st century CE. It offers a dialogue between the pregnant Isis and her solar-determined child in the papyrus thicket of Chemmis. The goddess asks questions about the future and the child answers and calms the mother, saying that injustice does not last; the hiding place is safe; Horus will take up his position as ruler, and he will act as an avenger. In other contexts, the Horus child is even aligned with the omniscient god Thoth (Stadler 2004 and 2006).

The motif of divining children is native to Egypt. Kallimachos, the librarian of Alexandria, integrates it together with other Egyptian motifs in his hymns, with which he praises the divine origin of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (Schlegel-

milch 2009: 2.1). On the so-called 'Mendes stela' Ptolemy celebrates himself as a ruler who was already elected for kingship when he was still in the womb, before he was born. He already was installed when he still was in his diapers and had already ruled while he was still sucking on the breasts. The stela shows a row of gods honored by the royal family (**Fig. 12**). The first figure behind the ram of Mendes is Horus as a child. The Horus name of Ptolemy was "The mighty boy" (*ḥwn qnj*). The Horus name is the first in the royal titulary, a name of programmatic mythological significance. It wants to say: He, Ptolemy, is the divine child, true God of true God (Schlegelmilch 2009: 208–209).

The integration of Harpocrates into a well established divine triad was not an invention of the Ptolemies in collaboration with the local clergy (Quaegebeur 1989). The stela of the flautist Ankh-Horpekhrod (**Fig. 11**) which was erected in the 22nd year of Shoshenq III (804 BCE) already shows the child god on a pedestal among the great adult gods and thus illustrates the already mentioned importance of Harpocrates for the Libyian Dynasty. The innovation of the Ptolemies was the explicit declaration of the new ruler as a divine child. In the mammisi of Edfu (**Fig. 13**) Ptolemaios VIII is depicted twice: Once as the adult reigning pharaoh and once as a child on a pedestal. Evidently it wasn't enough to declare the divine conception of the pharaoh. The divine child is now part of the image of the legitimate ruler.

However, in order to highlight the legitimacy of the royal house, the rhetoric of the divine child is not only used for the king but also for the queen. It is exciting to learn, that in Kallimachos' hymn for Artemis queen Arsinoë is portrayed by Kallimachos as Artemis sitting on the lap of Zeus as a self-assured, demanding girl. Evidently this composition without model in the Greek tradition was inspired by Hatshepsut's self-portrayals, sitting on the lap of Amun, an image copied by the builders of the Ptolemaic temples hundreds of years later. Thus, the royal-divine girl in the guise of Artemis-Arsinoë was set aside the royal-divine boy, in shape of Apollo-Philadelphos.

As Schlegelmilch has demonstrated, the depiction of Apollo, Artemis and other deities as children by Kallimachos' or Theocritus is not simply a rhetoric play with an entertaining effect, but rather a theme in Ptolemaic Egypt given in a programmatic way in the figure of the child god who warrants a renewed sovereignty.

Katja Lembke (2012) explains the increase of child gods in the Ptolemaic period within a multicultural dynamic of demotization or secularisation of Pharao's function. Sacral functions of the king were, among others, transferred to child gods, especially the function of mediation between humans and gods. This, so Lembke, has led to a new sacralization of the world, which favored the kingship of the gods.

Fig. 11: Upper part of a limestone stela from Mendes, 22nd year of Shoshenq III, ca. 804 BCE.



Fig. 12: The so called "Mendes stela", 257 BCE.



Fig. 13: Cultic acknowledgement of divine kingship of Ptolemy VIII. Detail of the mammisi of Edfu.

The manifold Greco-Roman adaptations of Harpocrates, by no means exhaustively treated here, reflect the potential and complexity of the initial Egyptian deity. However, not only the Greeks, but also the Levantines – often ignored in studies on Hellenistic Egypt – were inspired by the figure of Harpocrates. He was familiar to them for centuries as we have seen and animated them to create in Hellenistic-Roman times new religious concepts as will be shown in the following paragraphs with examples from the papyrus Leiden, with magical gems, with the soteriological function of Christ as child, and from monumental paintings preserved in antique descriptions only, one of them from Byzantine times fusing pagan and Christian ideas.

5.3. *Pshai-Harpocrates and Iao-Seth according to the cosmogony of Papyrus Leiden ("Leidener Weltschöpfung")*

The Papyrus Leiden[28], probably of the 4th century CE, comes evidently from a mixed Greek-Egyptian-Jewish milieu. It delivers two versions of a form for a ceremony – probably practiced since a long time – in the cult of the Alexandrian god of eternity, Aion. Aion is an aspect of Serapis or Helios. Other names for Serapis-Aion-Helios were Yahwe, pronounced Iao in Greek, and Abraxas (or Abrasax), a name with the numeric value 365 and thus a name for the solar year.

The ritual with the title "The eighth book of Moses" celebrates the full moon of springtime, that is the full moon in the sign of Aries, after 41 days of purification. It is deeply rooted in the traditional Egyptian cosmogony. At the same time, it offers elements which are common with the Jewish Pessach and the Christian Easter feast, celebrated at one and the same day. Similar to the reading of key texts from the Bible (e.g. Gen 1 and Ex 14) during the Easter vigil in the Christian church, the ritual recalls the acts of creation by the god Aion. He first creates the seven gods of the sun bark by his words, perceived as primordial sounds.

Then he creates an eighth god:[29] Pshai-Agathos-Daimon. P-shai consists of the sounds "p" for Phoibos(-Apollon) and "sh" for the dragon and means "the one who admeasures". "Dragon" was the name of the Nile branch west of Alexandria: an immense snake that brings the water, base for all life, the luck of Egypt. The Greeks identified Pshai therefore with the good Demon, the good destiny. The primordial god calls this eighth god "lilu" (child) and XPAT-ʿΩP, "child Horus" or Harpocrates. At the same time, he is Horus-Sobek, the sun and the primordial water, the potential power of the cosmos. But its creation endangers the whole universe which is on the point of collapse. Therefore, the creator immediately cries "iaô", like an echo of the last creation, in order to stabilize everything and thus a ninth god was created. Phoibos and IAÔ start to fight, the light-god arguing that he was first and Iao claiming that he fixed everything. IAÔ has to recognize that he is only the echo of the firstborn but the primordial god reconciles the two gods and offers each one a place of fame and a mighty name and he honors the "standing by" (IAÔ) as leader of all gods and with the mightiest name, including all powers of the gods, a name able to work wonders. In visual art this creation, encompassing and guiding all others, is often identified with Bes. On the Horus-stelae he is combined with the (solar) child

[28] Leiden, Museum van Oudheiden J 395; Preisendanz 1974; for the following see Merkelbach 1992.

[29] Eight being the number of the new beginning, the first day of a new week, the day of circumcision in the Jewish tradition (cf. Lev 12:3).

Fig. 14: Limestone stela from Egypt, ca. 250–50 BCE.



Fig. 15: Detail from the Metternich stela, ca. 380–342 BCE.

(**Fig. 14**). On the Metternich stela he is also depicted like a variant or incarnation of the Horus child (**Fig. 15**).

What originally was a myth of the reconciliation of Upper and Lower Egypt reads in the context of Alexandria as the reconciliation of Egypt (Horus) and Canaan (Baal-Seth), of Egyptians and Jews. What originally may have been the protocol of a royal ceremony was in the 3rd century CE maybe the ritual for a personal rite of passage, including the offering of the good destiny of the client by the priests on the base of his birth dates.

The Leiden papyrus is important for our subject because it attests the ongoing importance of the old Levantine-Egyptian constellation with Baal-Seth, the sun and the dragon (Keel 2009) in a new interpretation. Baal-Seth is now explicitly identified with IAÔ (Yahwe), the sun is evoked in its childlike image, and the dragon is no more the dangerous, insatiable sea but the Nile who brings its blessings according to everyone's destiny. We recognize the transformation of a constellation in the longue durée. However, the multiple steps of transitions and the social milieu where they happened can only be conjectured.

5.4. *The child and IAÔ on magical gems*

As the Egyptian thinking at its heart is an iconic thinking (Assmann 1982), the complex details of the cultic text are in fact an unfolding of icons. That's why the same themes could be expressed in a much more elegant way by different

arrangements of motifs around the central icon of the divine child, even on such a small scale as it had to be used for gems.

On a gem from the Merz Collection (**Fig. 16a**) Harpocrates as the sun-child sits in a traditional way on a lotus. The blossom has the form of a big *nb*-sign. The deity holds a finger of his right hand on his mouth. In his left he bears a cornucopia. The back side has the inscription thalkhal/Iao. Thalkhal is possibly a variation of the ablanathanalba-palindrom, an Aramaic formula maybe reading "father (ab) come to us (lanath)" (Németh 2010: 182; Bohak 2008: 210.233).[30] The same motif in a Hellenized, perspectival version (**Fig. 16b**) displays again Harpocrates sitting on the lotus flower, this time with a crooked scepter from the Osiris iconography, but otherwise with the gesture and nimbus of Helios, surrounded by the Greek vocals remembering the sounds of primordial creation. On the reverse side among else IAHÔ.

A masterful gem from the Kelsey Museum (**Fig. 16c**) displays the child still sitting on a lotus flower, but now in the sun-boat, his right foot on an enemy, flanked by two protective deities with Atef- and Hemhem-crown. The child has the Greek kind of nimbus with arrows, typical for Helios. Furthermore, a sun disc above the nimbus underlines the solar aspect of the child among a crescent, stars and animals representing stellar constellations. The scene in the boat is flanked by falcons. The same is true for the scarab in the center of the verso of the gem. One of those falcons is identified as IAÔ. Another parallelism of sun-child and scarab is seen on a gem from the Corpus Christi College in Cambridge (**Fig. 16d**), which shows four solar emblems within an Ouroboros, counterclockwise from top right: a standing baboon, crowned with a solar disk, greeting the sun-child on the lotus flower to the left, followed by a scarab and a falcon with double crown.

On a pendant from the Fitzwilliam Museum (**Fig. 16e**) the sun-child crouches on a lotus, coming out of a pool. Attached to the lotus we see an Ibis to the left and Kenmet (Chnoubis) to the right. The sun-child is surrounded by crocodiles, goats, falcons, and again is designated as IAÔ by an inscription. Formally the object remembers the Horus-stelae in a mini format. The sun-child replaces the Horus-child, facing wild animals. Furthermore, it displays the child as center of triad with Thot and Kenmet (= Isis), the two main protectors of the child.

A different constellation is to be found on two further gems from Cologne where the child assists his own creation. On **Fig. 16f** a sphere surrounded by an Ouroboros Chnum opens a uterus with a seven-bitted key. Above the scene Anubis as a mummy and Isis-Tyche with a key in her right hand are to be seen. Harpocrates is below the uterus, protected by the winged goddesses Isis and

[30] For the combination of Ablanathanalba and Iao see http://cbd.mfab.hu/cbd/1554/?sid=7393 (last access: 1 June 2024).



Fig. 16a–i: Magical gems displaying the godly child.

Nephthys. On the back side of the gem IAÔI, a variant of IAÔ is written. In a variant of the motif (**Fig. 16g**) Harpocrates sits in front of Chnum, forming the uterus. Bes in front of Hapocrates and Isis with situla behind Chnum.

A gem from Paphos (**Fig. 16h**) displays motifs of the iconography of the magical gems in a strange style, in non-canonical shapes and in a puzzling arrangement. Probably the amulet is to be read from the bottom up.[31] On the primordial water, symbolized as crocodile, the mummified creator (Osiris?) is sleeping in the solar bark. At the cry of a rooster he awakens to life, symbolized

[31] For a different interpretation of the iconography see Śliwa 2014.

by a similar Osiris-like figure, now standing as a child, empowered by the force of regenerated life, symbolized by a snake. The ruling sun as a child (with scepters?) finally appears in heaven, flanked by moon and star. A Christian reader of the amulet could have seen a Chi-Rho in the star with the two points. The verso of the gem features a perfect palindrome with 59 Greek letters, starting with the name of the Hebrew deity and continuing with an Egyptian sentence in Greek transcription. The sentence reads as: "Yahweh is the bearer of the secret name, the lion of Re secure in his shrine" (Śliwa 2014: 298).

In contrast to the hitherto presented items with the sitting child, a gem from the Fitzwilliam Museum (**Fig. 16i**) emphasizes the combative aspects of the primordial powers. Harpocrates is standing to the left, wrapped in a mantle, his head topped with a large lotus-crown, his right hand raised to the mouth, his left hand holding a flail. The inscription reads IAÔ. The recto of the gem displays the anguipede with cock-head, flail and shield.

Concluding, we may summarize that the solar child on the gems appears together with IAÔ, its echo. According to the papyrus Leiden (cf. above 4.3) the two complementary forces warrant the stability of the primordial and ongoing cosmic creation. The theological composition reconciles and unites image and word, Egyptian and Jewish traditions, in a mainly Greek style of artwork. The medium of the gems underlines the significance of the cosmic concepts for the individuals who identify themselves consciously or unconsciously with the child as an incarnation of the vital power of permanently regenerating life. The gem of Paphos, being a place of early Christian mission and probably a competence center for magic (Acts 13:6–13), illustrates the ongoing relevance of the pagan divine child in a Christian dominated place and thus makes the assumption plausible that pagan and Christian ways to explain the world stimulated each other during centuries.

5.5. *Christian adaptations and transformations of the divine child*

Egyptian royal theology and early Christology are connected by a history of traditions as Joachim Kügler (1997) has shown. Firstly, because of the Egyptian elements already being transmitted within biblical royal theology, secondly because of the involvement of Egyptian Judaism under Hellenistic influence with Egyptian culture, and thirdly because of the strong reception of Egyptian religion in the Roman Empire to which the newly emerging Christianity reacts. For example, Domitian was celebrated in Rome as a pharaoh, almost three hundred years after the erection of the first Isis temple in Italy. Kügler plausibly suggests that Luke in this context extended the Pauline Christology of exaltation (Rom

1:3–4, cf. Acts 13:32–33) with a retrospective rule of reason by prefixing to his gospel narratives the miraculous birth of Jesus (Luke 1–2).

According to the ancient view, the role of a human being was forcibly marked by the workshop of nature in the prenatal stage and by instruction in the formative milieu "in diapers". This view is clearly expressed by Philo of Alexandria in a speech of the emperor Gaius Caligula (Leg Gaj 54–56).[32] On the Jewish side, due to the reliance on nature and human welfare, the equality of all people was emphasized. In the words of the king in the wisdom of Solomon (Sap. Sal. 7:4–5), a text probably composed in Alexandria at the beginning of the 1st century CE: "I was nursed with care in swaddling cloths. For no king has had a different beginning of existence."

Hence, on the one hand, Luke and Matthew refer to Jesus as the Son of God or of the Most High in their childhood gospels (Matt 2:15, Luke 1:32, 35), and on the other hand they underline his human need and poverty: A child, wrapped in diapers, lying in a manger. They follow the concept of divine sonship with its roots in Ancient Near Eastern theology of light and sun[33], and at the same time this theology is typically broken in Jewish terms (cf. Schreiber 2010).

This is true also for the topos of the persecuted and rescued ruler-child transferred on Jesus by Matthew.[34] The sanctuary of the Holy Family is Egypt. The Christian interpretation emphasizes in the explanation of this fact the scripture's statement (Hos 11:1) cited by Matthew that Jesus' family had to flee to Egypt, because Israel was called as the Son of God from there.[35] By doing so, Jesus was

[32] "[54] From the swaddling-clothes I have had ten thousand instructors, fathers, brothers, uncles, cousins, and grandfathers, up to the very founders of my family, in fact every one related to me either on my father's or my mother's side, who had acquired absolute power for themselves, even without taking into consideration the fact that, by their being the authors of my being, they had implanted in me some degree of royal power and some natural aptitude for government. [55] For as similitudes of both body and soul exist both in the form, and position, and motions of men, and also as the inclinations, and dispositions, and actions of men are preserved in some degree of similitude through the principles of descent, so also is it probable that the very same principles should convey an outline of similitude in respect of one's aptitude for government. [56] Shall any one, then, who is ignorant dare to instruct me who am the reverse of ignorant? me who, even before my birth, while I was yet in my mother's womb, was fashioned as an emperor in the workshop of nature?" (transl. Charles Duke Yonge)

[33] Explicitly so in the Latin gospel of the childhood of the savior (Liber de infantia salvatoris 73): "Erat autem ipse infans solummodo" (sc. solis modo). The gospel was probably compiled in the 7th century CE but the processed material is much older.

[34] Luz ^{5}2002: Table between p. 126 and p. 127 compares Moses, Abraham, Apk 12, Kypselos, Mithridates, Romulus & Remus, Augustus, Nero, Gilgamesh, Sargon, Kyros, Zarathustra, Frêdun and Krishna. Strangely, the Seth-Horus-myth figures among "weitere, entferntere Parallelen". The parallels to the persecuted Horus in gospel's story of the flight to Egypt are ignored (ibid., 183–185).

[35] The old question, if the messianic child is a singular savior or rather a group of faithful believers must not be decided, for in an Israelite or Judean context a strong interrelation between the anointed sovereign and his supporters was always constitutive. Thus on the coins of the Hasmoneans we not only find the name of the king or highpriest, but also the community of the Jews is

identified as the paradigmatic son of Israel. But that's just one side of the royal medal. In view of the widespread image of the mother (Isis) with her child (Horus) in the protective swamp thicket of Chemmis the call "get up, take the child and his mother, and flee to Egypt" was also understandable as an allusion to the salvation of the endangered Horus-child. The Egyptian Christians have raised this "flight to Egypt" as their national icon (**Fig. 17**).[36]

In their words, the icon is titled "The coming of our Lord to Egypt with his mother and Joseph, the carpenter" (*duḫūl al-sayed 'ila miṣr m'a ummihi wa yūsef al-naǧār*). The icon takes on an explicitly Egyptian position. It expresses happiness about the coming of the Son of God and at the same time appeals to the local hospitality. It shows the Virgin with the child on a donkey, led by Joseph in the back and (sometimes) an angel in front. The donkey, not mentioned in the biblical text, is an addition of the icon painter, but not an accidental one. The most likely source is a constellation from the arsenal of the vignettes of the Horus-stelae. These included among others the motif of Horus of Hebenu, portrayed as a falcon on an antelope, and the spear-wielding Onuris and Re-Harachte, Thoth or other deities. These figures are shown on some late specimens of the genus "Horus-stela" in a triple constellation (**Fig. 18a** and **18c**): First the spear-wielding Onuris, then Horus of Hebenu, followed by a second male deity with scepter. On the stela from Uppsala (**Fig. 18b**) the same figures are arranged in a different order. On the Horus-stelae of Fribourg and Uppsala (**Fig. 18a–b**)

mentioned (Staubli/Schroer 2014: Abb. 47c–d). A similar ambivalence is visible in the versions of Hos 11:1: "Out of Egypt I called my son (*ben*)", according to M and "out of Egypt I called my children (*tekna*)" according to LXX. Matthew (2:15) quotes the Masoretic text in order to prove the messianic legacy of Jesus. While the writer of the gospel emphasizes the messianity of Christ, for the writer of the book of Revelation the messianic mission of all faithful believers is important. In Revelation 12:5 we find the imagery of a child, born by a woman, but menaced by a dragon. According to Häfner this scene in heaven symbolizes the situation of the faithful Christians, born by the church. The lucky end of the dramatic scenery of a fight between angels, depicted in this chapter, shall reassure the persecuted addressees of the book, that the conflict from which they suffer is already decided in heaven (Häfner 2005).

[36] The Coptic tradition, based on a vision of the late 4th century CE of the 23rd Coptic pope Theophilus locates the sojourn of the Holy Family in Egypt in different places in order to honor all the places where the travel of the holy refugees was memorized. The main location however is the historical church on mount Qus'qam in Al-Muharraq (Assiut), a place in Middle Egypt and not in the delta region. As Fatin Morris Guirguis (2010) has demonstrated Theophilus' vision and its oral tradition in hymns and icons in the Coptic and Ethiopian church is until our days the fundamental matrix of the Christian Egyptian culture, connecting autochthonous traditions with the local geography and also with the Old Testament. Thus, e.g. the swift cloud on which the Lord (YHWH) came to Egypt according to Is 19:1 is identified with the Virgin Mary. The pagan pre-Christian aspects of this traditions however, are often neglected or hidden in research. The Persea tree who according to the vision of Theophilus venerated the Lord Jesus Christ when arriving as a refugee child became one of the most prominent holy objects of the Coptic church (Guirguis 2010: 302), venerated also by local muslims as "worshippers' tree" (*šagrat el-'abīd*) in Gabl el-Tayr. On the background of the importance of the holiness of trees, and especially Persea trees in Ancient Egypt (Keel 1992) it is evident, that the Christian and Arab traditions are adapted varieties of a former pagan cult.

Fig. 17: Icon of the coming of the Lord to Egypt, date and provenience unknown.

Fig. 18a–c: Vignettes from Horus-stelae.

above this we see Isis nursing Horus in the papyrus thicket of Chemmis, a scene that can also be found on most Horus-stelae somewhere.[37]

Against this background it is noteworthy that on the Christian icon Joseph does not put his staff on the floor, as one would expect from a traveller, but elevates it to a diagonal position. Does the gesture possibly continue the type of the spear-wielding Onuris? The arrangement of the mount between two companions could already point to a Levantine influence on the Horus-stelae, since the way of traveling on the donkey with two human companions on foot was typical for this area (Staubli 1991: 106–107, 181–183; id. 2010: 3.1) and atypical for Egypt, where ships were mainly used for transports. The cursory drawing of the vignettes on the simple Horus-stelae probably facilitated the interpretation of the antelope as a donkey (cf. **Fig. 18b**). Both, antelope and donkey were understood

[37] The parallelism of Horus as Harpocrates and as falcon is also to be found in the Mammisi of Philae. Harpocrates is formed by Khnum on the potters' wheel. On the back wall of the mammisi the falcon is to be found amidst a papyrus thicket.

as animals of Seth. Another example of the afterlife of Sethian symbolism in Coptic art is the apotropaic cross with an antelope bound on it (Frankfurter 2004).

If my reconstruction of the genesis of the Coptic icon is correct, it is a manifest iconographic evidence for the role model of Horus modelling Jesus Christ. The Christian iconographers normally[38] deny a link between oriental or classical images of a child god and the image of Jesus as child (Haussherr 1970: 401) although they do not deny some influences of the idea of god as a child on Christian art. Pagan and Jewish-Christian child-gods react on the same need. Harpocrates together with Hermes as a Young God, the God-Son, Kairos as Aion replacing Kronos-Chronos, and the Good Shepherd, another manifestation of the sun god, "expressed the widespread feeling of an age which, tired of the remote old gods, expected salvation from the birth of the divine child" and all of them could be identified with Christ (Barb 1964: 8).

The maybe most explicit Christian link to the ancient child-god theology is to be found in the Levant. According to Ephraem the Syrian, Simeon in his famous hymn testifies that "the Infant truly was the Ancient of Days", "the aged man was younger than the infant", the babe "was older than sun and man" (§29; § 22; §23; Kantorowicz 1965: 29). Kantorowicz (1965: 32) points to originally Egyptian, then Greek and finally Roman solar concepts which probably stand behind this theology. We may add that the Levant was probably the most creative area of transformation and fusion.

Apart from the veneration of the savior-child in the manger by shepherds and wise men and of the icon of the flight of the endangered child there is a further, often neglected infant-icon of Christ: The presentation of Jesus at the Temple. The presentation of the child to the just man Simeon and the prophet Hannah includes the explicit acceptance of Jesus as savior: "My eyes have seen your *salvation* which you have prepared in the presence of all peoples, a *light* for revelation to the Gentiles, and for *glory* to your people Israel" (Luke 2:30–32). In visual art the image of the presentation of Jesus at the temple was often combined or even fused with the child's circumcision. Both scenes, the recognition of the divine child and its circumcision, are part of the famous Egyptian myth of the "Procreation of the Divine Son or Daughter", represented in Egyptian temples and mammisi since the late 15th century BCE (Assmann 1982). In scene 10 the father Amun greets his son, presented by the sitting Hathor. In scene 11 he takes the child on his bosom with the words: "Welcome my son/my daughter of

[38] An exception is El-Khachab, according to whom the shift from Harpocrates to Jesus Christ or sometimes rather the fusion or identification of Harpocrates with Christ can be traced on late Roman gems from Alexandria and environments. "We find the representation of Jesus Christ on the lotus in the manner of the typical representation of Harpocrates on the lotus" (El-Khachab 1971: 136). Unfortunately, he does not offer an image which illustrates his statement.

my body". After scenes with the nursing of the child follows in scene 14 a further presentation of the child by Thot and a further recognition of the child by father Amun with the words: "My beloved proper son, procreated in my similitude." This scene with textual parallels in Ps 2:7 and Luke 3:22 is followed by the circumcision of the child in scene 15 accompanied by blessings of the gods for the child: Fullness of life, eternal persistence, sovereignty over the world. In the late mammisi of Dendera a further recognition of the child by Harachte was added. The Egyptian relief cycles, still existing today, remember the importance of the recognition of the son by the father in Egypt and in a very similar way in the neighboring Levant. However, this powerful and very old and long lasting cultural background is ignored in the commentaries of the gospel of Luke[39] and in the reconstruction of the history of the icon of the scenery and its celebration in the liturgy (Shorr 1946). The emperor Justinian maybe intuitively felt the strong symbolic impact for the rectification of just government in the constellation celebrated in the festival of Hypapante ("encounter"). He used it for the demonstration of his piety by the recognition of the divine child and the virgin Mary, when he renewed and reinforced the festival in 542 (Meier 2002).

What we should retain from the history of the motif of the recognition of the son for the study of our subject is, that it had a long lasting tradition of representation in art before the Christian era and then again in the Christian symbol system. Therefore, the Christian icon should not be seen as a pure illustration of the text of Luke. Rather Luke's account of the recognition of Jesus, first by the naïve, poor shepherds (Luke 1:20), then as salvation (*sôtêrion*), light (*phôs*), and glory (*dóxa*) by the old righteous Simeon and Hannah, and finally by God himself (Luke 3:22) with the same words as in the old Egyptian myths, is part of a greater Egyptian-Levantine tradition of respect toward the divine child.

5.6. *The divine child as a key figure in Roman and Byzantine Phoenician literature and art*

Achilles Tatius, a novelist of the 2nd century CE, describes a painting in Sidon, showing Zeus as bull with Europa on it, guided by Eros: "Love, in the guise of a tiny boy, his wings stretched out, wearing his quiver, his lighted torch in his hands: he was turning towards Zeus with a smile on his face, as if he were laughing at him for becoming a bull for his sake" (I,1; Gazelee 1917: 9). The novelist,

[39] Bovon 1989: 137 recalls Greek, Jewish and even Buddhist parallels, but doesn't mention Egypt. The problem is, that he is form-critically misguided. It is not mainly a story of an encounter guided by God, but a story about God's recognition of his son through the old, just persons. Functionally they take the place of the highest God if we compare the Christian images with the Egyptian prototypes. The old Egyptian constellation appears in a new Jewish version. Amun was replaced by a male and a female Zadiq.

writing in the first person, exclaims: "Look, how that imp dominates over sky and land and sea!" (I,2; ibid.). For the novelist that scene and his comment about its function as a motto for the whole novel, reporting the life story of a Phoenician, driven in all his acts by the mighty power of love.

The divine child embodies an elementary emotion, pure and likewise anarchic like a child. At the same time it is woven in the most famous story of Sidon, the abduction of Europa on the bull, to be found in an emblematic form on the coins of the city.[40]

John of Gaza wrote in the times of Justinian on demand of some professors a poem on an artwork which possibly decorated the new winter-bath of Gaza which has been built shortly after 536 CE (Friedländer 1912: 111). "He (the artist) depicts the intangible nature in bodily forms by painting human figures" (I,19; cf. Friedländer 1912: 166). In the middle of the composition John recognizes a child, representing the new light of the day: "For the earliness in the morning gives birth to the young light from her lap […] he steps brilliantly, adorned with a wreath, in the middle, riding up naked, in absolutely cheerful clarity. He is just stretching his legs and arms in balance, because he rises to the righteous and at the same time shines on the godless" (I,58–65; cf. Friedländer 1912: 170). The symmetric posture of the child, stretching his legs and arms in balance, is a reminder of the figure of Shu or Heh. A further figure in a similar position is mentioned in the second part of John's poem, probably forming a symmetric counterpart in the composition of the whole artwork. It is an angel, lifting up the earth, and thus assuming a similar function as Atlas, holding the heaven. The adornment of the child with a wreath is a Greek element. The whole composition was inscribed in a cross and three concentric circles that symbolized the passion of incarnated word and the Holy Trinity. Thus, the artwork was a fantastic amalgam of Greek, Egyptian and Christian elements in a typically Levantine spirit.

In this case the divine child embodies an elementary power of the cosmos, the light, new, fresh and developable as a child.

5.7. *Harpocrates and Buddha on the lotus*

Although it seems to be evident that the image of Horus on the lotus remained popular over centuries and proliferated during the Hellenistic-Roman period, the question of the limits of the images' dissemination remains open. This question is especially virulent in the case of the famous motif of Buddha on the lotus, the main image of Buddhism. Are Harpocrates and Buddha linked by a tradition of art? Chiara Lombardi (2011/12) raises the question on the occasion of the dis-

[40] Head ^{2}1967: 287, 461, 465–467, 472, 525, 727–728, 797–798.

covery of a Harpocrates-figurine in Bactria, more than 4000km afar from Memphis. She concludes, that the finger on the mouth developed separately in Egypt and in India with different meanings. In India the gesture is connected with reverence, joy, and astonishment. The lotus, known in both cultures, was independently found to be a symbol of regeneration. In contrast, the princes lock could be a rather rare Egyptian heritage in the east.

Already more than half a century ago the question was answered in the affirmative. In the area of Gandhara in the Swat valley of India, where Alexander's army had come, the innovative iconography of Buddhism unfolded under the influence of Hellenistic art. Here, in the land of the lotus, the image of the sun god on the flower has found fertile ground, so that the most important Buddhist devotional images show the Buddha Gautama on the lotus.[41] However, Buddha is not anymore a child with the finger in his mouth. He is a young man, regenerating his life by meditation on the lotus, a symbol deeply rooted in Hindu mythology, connected with Brahma, Vishnu, being a deity in itself, called Sri, symbolizing the powers maintaining existences, purity, and even the powerful wisdom of Nirvana (Ward 1952).

6. Conclusions

This study tried to visualize transitions in the motif of the divine child by merging insights from different epochs and disciplines in order to establish a feeling for the histoire de longue durée and the transitions in time and space.

Trying to systemize the manifold aspects of child gods[42] three main functions of the image of the divine child can be distinguished: The endangered child, sometimes even representing the dead (cf. 3.5), who at the same time is the healing deity; the saving child who embodies a new, just dynasty; and the cosmic child, representing the radiant new light of the day and the sun. Each type is associated with main iconographic elements and was visualized with suitable media (cf. **Tab. 5**). However, it should be kept in mind that the images sometimes were multifunctional, depending of the context of their setting or use.

[41] Morenz and Schubert 1954 following Foucher 1905, Le Coq 1926 and Ippel 1940; Jung and Kerényi (1951) in their often reprinted study on the divine child speculate about connections between Greek and Far Eastern child myths while they strangely neglect the Egyptian (and Levantine) impact on the theme.

[42] According to Dagmar Budde (2010: 4–5) they are providers of life and food, guarantors of fertility, eternal renewal, and the continuity of legitimate royal and hereditary succession, protectors against enemies, diseases, and other dangers, guarantors of a successful birth, regeneration, and victory over death. They were consulted in oracular procedures, for they were believed to have wisdom about the future. Last not least they were a source of joy, especially as musicians.

The image of the divine child is attested in Egypt since prehistoric times and seems to be connected with the need for magic protection of children (1). In the New Kingdom the theological icon of the sun-child on the lotus was developed, representing at the same time the regenerated sun and the regenerated king (2). The motif gained popularity with the Libyan dynasties and spread over the whole Mediterranean. In this study I tried to demonstrate that the Levant and the Nile Delta, where many Levantines settled, were the centers for the vulgarization (3.1–7) and the transformations of the image (4.1–6).[43] Whether the image was influencing Hindu and Buddhist iconography as well, remains an open question at the moment (4.7).

main aspects	The endangered/ healing child (medicine)	The savior-child (politics)	The cosmic child (theology)
associated main iconographic elements	– crocodiles – scorpions – lions – snakes – donkey – mother / (father)	– crowns – flagellum – pedestal	– sun-disc – lotus
main media	– amulets – magical texts – bronze-figures – coins – Horus-stela	– temple reliefs – memorial-stela – bronze-figures – gems	– ivories – silver bowls – stamp seals – gems – frescos
Christian adaptions	Coptic icon	Christmas-icon	birth of Christ on 24th of December

Tab. 5: The image of the godly child:
Aspects, associated iconems, media and Christian adaptions.

Important places of transformation were the healing centers of the region where the image was propagated with new media and fused with older images of healing deities such as Reshef, Eshmun, and Shed (3.4; Excursus; 3.6; 4.1). With the reign of the Lagids in Egypt the Hellenized Egyptians and the Egyptianized Greeks transformed the motif of the child-god aesthetically and in regard of his concepts as has been researched in many studies (4.2). It was fused with Greek deities like Dionysos and Eros, the gesture of the finger on the mouth

[43] The crucial role of the Levantines in the development and the distribution of the image of God as a child is not mirrored in important Egyptological studies on the subject. See for instance Budde, Sandri, and Verhoeven 2003. A reason for this is the lack of the study of mass media (amulets), another one the narrow focus of disciplines.

acquired a new meaning, and his function as savior and god of the Dynasty was more important than ever before. At the same time Egypt was the favored land for Jewish migrants. Alexandria was a place where the Jews lived in close proximity with Greeks and Egyptians. Probably here, in a context of magic speculative theology the divine child was fused with IAÔ, a Jewish re-interpretation of the Canaanite god Baal-Seth (4.3–4). It was in this context of cultural permeability that the Christian religion, itself of Jewish origins, emerged. We find the imprints of the divine child prominently in the symbol-system of the new religion (4.5–6). The endangered child stands in the focus of the gospel of Matthew and was visualized in the tradition of the Horus-child in the Coptic icon of the coming of the Lord to the safe harbor of Egypt. The savior-child, pronounced in the gospels of Luke and Matthew, venerated by shepherds and wise men, became the center of the Western Christmas-icon. The Eastern Christmas-icon merged Christ in the manger with Christ in the coffin, thus connecting the child with the dead and resurrected Christ in the tradition of Horus and Osiris. The cosmic child was monumentalized in the Christian calendar by placing its birth shortly after the longest night, thus eternalizing its light-nature as *sol invictus*.

List of Figures

Fig. 1 Amulets and amulet molds of the sun/Horus or Ptah as a child.

a. Gold, Megiddo, 1250–1100 BCE, Oriental Institute, Chicago A21133.3 (Herrmann 1994: Nr. 7).[44]
b. Bronze-amulet, Akko, 450–44 BCE, Israel Antiquity Authority 73-224 (Herrmann 2007: 1).
c. Bronze, 28 x 8 x 8 mm, ʿAtlit, 3rd–1st century BCE, Jerusalem, Rockefeller Museum 32.892 (Herrmann 1994: Nr. 15).
d. Composite material, 42 x 16 x 12 mm, Lachish, 850–800 BCE, Cambridge, Cambridge University 61.D.138b (Herrmann 1994: Nr. 16).
e. Terracotta, 18 x 11 x 4 mm (cast only), Qantir, 1292–1070 BCE, private collection (Herrmann 1985: 11).
f. Terracotta, 15 x 8 x 2 mm (cast only), Qantir, 1292–1070 BCE, private collection (Herrmann 1985: 6).
g. Terracotta, 10 x 7 x 2 mm (cast only), Qantir, 1292–1070 BCE, Fribourg, Bible+Orient Museum ÄAF 1982.285 (Herrmann 1985: 1332).

[44] For parallels see http://www.bible-orient-museum.ch/bodo/details.php?bomid=31513 (last access: 1 June 2024).

h. Terracotta, 48 x 14 mm (cast only), Qantir, 1292–1070 BCE, Cairo, Egyptian Museum (Khawam 1971: New Kingdom XVII:1).
i. Terracotta, 12 x 9 x 2 mm (cast only), Qantir, 1292–1070 BCE, private collection (Herrmann 1985: 22).
j. Scarab; Tell el-Ajjul; 18th Dynasty, not before Thutmosis III; Jerusalem, Rockefeller Museum IAA 33.1731 (Keel 1997: Tell el-ʿAǧul Nr. 430).[45]
k. Composite material, 38 x 17 x 13 mm, Lachish, 1300–1100 BCE, Manchester, Manchester Museum, Herrmann 1994: Nr. 596.

Fig. 2 Pendant recto and verso, gold with glass inlays, 7.1 x 2.5 cm, Abu Gurob (?), 19th–24th Dynasty, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 68.836 (drawing by the author).[46]

Fig. 3 Pair of bracelets, gold, lapis lazuli, Tanis (San el-Hagar), ca. 940 BCE (22nd Dynasty), British Museum, London EA 14594-5 (Meeks 2010: Nr. 194).[47]

Fig. 4 Amulett, faience and black ink, 9.63 cm high, Eastern Delta, ca. 800–740 BCE, Louvre E 10943 (Schroer 2018: Nr. 1431).

Fig. 5 Ivories from Samaria, ca. 800–722 BCE.
a. Ivory, 6.2 x 5.4 cm, Samaria, ca. 800–722 BCE, Jerusalem, Israel Museum IAA 1933-2574 (Crowfoot and Crowfoot 1938: Pl. I,1*).
b. Ivory, Samaria, ca. 800–722 BCE (Crowfoot and Crowfoot 1938: Pl. I,2*).
c. Ivory, 5 x 4.2 cm, Samaria, ca. 800–722 BCE, Jerusalem, Israel Museum IAA 1933-2549 (Crowfoot and Crowfoot 1938: Pl. I,3*).

Fig. 6 Silverbowls.
a. Silver bowl, Dm. 19.0–19.5 cm, Praeneste, Tomba Bernardini, 8th century BCE, Rome, Villa Giulia 61574 (Perrot and Chipiez 1885: Fig. 36; Markoe 1985: 274).
b. Silver bowl, Dm. 18.8 cm, Amathus, around 700 BCE, British Museum 123053 (Markoe 1985: 248).[48]

Fig. 7 Amulet, bronze, 28 x 27 x 1 mm, vicinity of Tyre, ca. 26th Dynasty (664–525 BCE), current location unknown[49] (Sader 1990: 319, Fig. 3

[45] http://www.bible-orient-museum.ch/bodo/search_einfach.php?id=60f19924a3f4d#&bomid=19078 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[46] https://collections.mfa.org/objects/155962/pendant-on-a-chain?ctx=e5c28b12-4e31-49fd-8427-43c27e6fc0e5&idx=9 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[47] https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/Y_EA14595 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[48] https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1931-0819-1 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[49] Schmitz 2002: 817 n. 3.

[photo] and 320, Fig. 4 [drawing]; Schmitz 2002: 818, fig 1*). (My drawing combines the information on the drawings from Sader and Schmitz.)

Fig. 8 The divine child on amulets.
a. Dan, 884–525 BCE, Beth-Shemesh IAA 68-1344 (Keel 2010: Dan Nr. 21).
b. Naukratis, 600–570 BCE, British Museum EA66500.[50]
c. Akko, 750–525 BCE, current repository unknown (Keel 1997: Akko Nr. 197).
d. Akko, 728–525 BCE, Jerusalem IAA 73-175 (Keel 1997: Akko Nr. 105).
e. Amrit, 664–525 BCE, British Museum E48227.[51]
f. Israel/Juda, 8th century BCE, Israel Museum 68.35.197 (Avigad and Sass 1997: Nr. 126).
g. Steatite scaraboid, Revadim, 7th century BCE (Avigad and Sass 1997: Nr. 1067).
h. Amrit, 664–525 BCE, British Museum E48218.[52]
i. Akko, 664–525 BCE, Jerusalem IAA 73-143 (Keel 1997: Akko Nr. 71).
j. Akko, 664–525 BCE, Jerusalem IAA 73-171 (Keel 1997: Akko Nr. 106).
k. Amrit, 664–525 BCE, British Museum E48235.[53]
l. Levant, 664–525 BCE, private collection.
m. Levant, 664–525 BCE (Schroer 2018: Nr. 1796).

Fig. 9 Bronze statuettes from Egypt/Phoenicia.
a. 6th–4th century BCE, 26.82 cm high, British Museum ANE 132908 (Barnett 1963–64: Pl. 41a).[54]
b. 2nd half of 6th century BCE, 26 cm high (without pedestal), Madrid, Museo Arqueologico National 2150 (Ferron 1971: lamina I–IV; id. 1974: tav. XXV; Amadasi Guzzo 1996: IV,1 [but note that the photograph has been placed erroneously with legend IV,2!]).

Fig. 10 Fragment of Sculptor's model, limestone, 15.3 x 13.2 x 3.0 cm, Tell Nabasha, early 3rd century BCE (Nielsen, Gasperini, and Mamedow 2016: 72, Fig. 9; drawing by the author).

[50] https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/Y_EA66500 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[51] https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1884-0714-213 (last acc.: 1 June 2024).
[52] https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1884-0714-204 (last acc.: 1 June 2024).
[53] https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1884-0714-222 (last acc.: 1 June 2024).
[54] https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1960-1210-1 (last access: 1 June 2024).

Fig. 11 Upper part of stela, limestone, 52.1 x 32.4 x 6.4 cm, Mendes, 22nd year of Shoshenq III, ca. 804 BCE, Brooklyn Museum 67.118 (drawing by the author).[55]

Fig. 12 The so called "Mendes stela". Stela, Mendes, 147 cm high, 257 BCE, Cairo CG 22181 (Clarysse 2007; Skuse 2017: 95).

Fig. 13 Cultic acknowledgement of divine kingship of Ptolemy VIII. Detail of the mammisi of Edfu (Chassinat 1939: Pl. 13).

Fig. 14 Stela, limestone, 15.6 x 5.8 x 3 cm, Egypt, ca. 250–50 BCE, Bible+ Orient Museum, Fribourg ÄFig 2001.2 (Bickel 2004: 74, Abb. 19a; drawing by the author).

Fig. 15 Detail from the Metternich stela (after Golenischeff 1877). The nine-faced, Bes headed god of the universe, walking (like the Horus child) over seven dangers. The importance of the magical number seven is also evident from the seven wings of the deity and the seven powers hold in each hand of the upper pair of arms (to knifes, two snakes, Djed, Ankh, and Was-scepter). The signs of the seven gods to the left and to the right of the Djed-pillar on the god's head. The eighth god, in the position of Heh/Shu (Horus) over the ram horns, protected by eight knifes.

Fig. 16 Magical gems displaying the godly child.
- a. Gem, lapislazuli, 15 x 11 mm, 2nd–3rd century CE, Bern, Merz Collection 193.3 (Willers and Raselli-Nydegger 2003: 184.187).
- b. Gem, green to black jasper, Egypt, 3rd century CE, British Museum, London EA 56257 (Michel 2001: 78f, No. 120).[56]
- c. Gem, haematite, Egypt, 2nd–3rd century CE, Kelsey Museum 26109; (Bonner 1950: No. 210).[57]
- d. Gem, jasper, 1.5 cm high, Egypt, 3rd–4th century CE, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (GB) C 18 (Henig 1975: 59, No. 244).[58]
- e. Pendant, serpentine, 2.6 cm high, Egypt, 3rd–4th century CE, Fitz-william Museum, Cambridge (GB) B 320 (CM) (Henig 1994: No. 498; Michel 2004: No. 19.4.f_1).[59]
- f. Gem, black haematite, 1.77 cm high, Egypt, 150–250 CE, Institut für Altertumskunde, Köln 25 (Zwierlein-Diehl 1992: 86, No. 23).[60]

[55] https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/opencollection/objects/3762 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[56] http://cbd.mfab.hu/cbd/520/?sid=7355 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[57] http://cbd.mfab.hu/cbd/1401/?sid=7354 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[58] http://cbd.mfab.hu/cbd/145/?sid=7353 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[59] http://cbd.mfab.hu/cbd/102/?sid=7352 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[60] http://cbd.mfab.hu/cbd/233/?sid=7351 (last access: 1 June 2024).

g. Gem, brownish-black haematite, 2.30 cm high, Egypt, 150–250 CE, Institut für Altertumskunde, Köln 23 (formerly F.S. Matouk collection); Zwierlein-Diehl 1992: 86, No. 23.[61]
h. Gem, brown steatite (?), 4.12 cm high, Paphos, 5th century CE; (Śliwa 2013: Pl. 1).
i. Gem, black magnetite, 1.55 cm high, Egypt, 3rd–4th century CE, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (GB) B 326 (CM) (Henig 1994: 231, No. 508; Michel 2004: 3.+.3.a_10).[62]

Fig. 17 Icon of the coming of the Lord to Egypt, date and provenience unknown, Coptic Museum, Cairo.[63]

Fig. 18 Vignettes from Horus-stelae.
a. Fribourg, Collections Bible+Orient ÄFig 2001.12 (Bickel 2004: 75, Abb. 19b; drawing by the author).
b. Uppsala VM 145 (Sternberg-El Hotabi 1999: Abb. 88a; Bd. II,8).
c. Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum Inv.-Nr. 10.264 (Sternberg-El Hotabi 1999: Abb. 88b; Bd. II,90).

References

Aimé-Giron, M. Noël, 1924, Glanures de mythologie syro-égyptienne: *BIFAO* 23, 1–25.

Allen, James P., 2005, *The Art of Medicine in Ancient Egypt. With an Essay by David T. Mininberg*, New York et al.

Amadasi Guzzo, Maria Giulia, 1996, Su tre iscrizioni fenicie dall'Egitto: formule augurali e cronologia, in: Enrico Acquaro (ed.), *Alle soglie della classicità. Il Mediterraneo tra tradizione e innovazione. Studi in onore di Sabatino Moscati, vol. 3*, Pisa, 1044–61, Tav. IV.

Assmann, Jan, 1975, *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*, Zürich/München.

Assmann Jan, 1982, Die Zeugung des Sohnes. Bild, Spiel, Erzählung und das Problem des ägyptischen Mythos, in: Jan Assmann, Walter Burkert, and Fritz Stolz, *Funktionen und Leistungen des Mythos. Drei altorientalische Beispiele* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 48), Fribourg/Göttingen, 13–61.

Avi-Yonah, Michael, [2]1940, *Map of Roman Palestine*, Jerusalem.

Avigad, Nahman, and Benjamin Sass, 1997, *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals* (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Section of Humanities), Jerusalem.

[61] http://cbd.mfab.hu/cbd/231/?sid=7347 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[62] http://cbd.mfab.hu/cbd/118/?sid=7343 (last access: 1 June 2024).
[63] https://www.juancole.com/2013/12/coptic-artwork-picture.html (last access: 1 June 2024).

Barb, Alphons Augustinus, 1964, Three Elusive Amulets: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 27, 1–22.

Barnett, Richard D., 1963–64, A Review of Acquisitions of Western Asiatic Antiquities 1955–62 (II): *British Museum Quarterly* 27, 3/4, 85 with Pl. 41a.

Barnett, Richard D., [2]1975, *A Catalogue of the Nimrud Ivories*, London.

Barnett, Richard D., 1982, *Ancient Ivories in the Middle East*, Jerusalem.

Barnett, Richard D., 1985, Lachish, Ashkelon and the Camel: A Discussion of its Use in Southern Palestine, in: Jonathan N. Tubb (ed.), *Palestine in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Papers in Honour of Olga Tufnell* (University College London Institute of Archaeology Publications 16), London, 31–49.

Beloch, Julius, 1923, *Griechische Geschichte*, Bd. 3/2, Strassburg.

Bertsch, Julia, Katja Broschat, and Christian Eckmann, 2017, Die Goldblechbeschläge aus dem Grab des Tutanchamun: *iDAI.publications, Kairo*, 54–57. https://publications.dainst.org/journals/index.php/efb/article/view/1951 (last accessed: 1 June 2024).

Bickel, Susanne (ed.), 2004, *In ägyptischer Gesellschaft. Aegyptiaca der Sammlungen BIBEL+ORIENT an der Universität Freiburg/Schweiz*, Fribourg.

Bohak, Gideon, 2008, *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History*, Cambridge.

Bonhême, Marie-Ange and Annie Forgeau, 1988, *Pharaon. Les secrets du pouvoir*, Paris.

Bonner, Campbell, 1950, *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, Ann Arbor.

Borghouts, Joris F., 1994, Magical Practices among the Villagers, in: Leonard H. Lesko (ed.), *Pharaoh's Workers. The Villagers of Deir El Medina*, Ithaca/London, 119–130.

Bovon, François, 1989, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament III/1), Zürich/Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Bricault, Laurent, 2006, Deities from Egypt on Coins of the Southern Levant: *Israel Numismatic Research* 1, 123–135.

Bricault, Laurent, Yann Le Bohec, and Jean-Louis Podvin, 2004, Cultes isiaques en Proconsulaire, in: Laurent Bricault (ed.), *Isis en Occident: Actes du II[ème] colloque international sur les études isiaques, Lyon III, 16–17 Mai 2002*, Leiden et al., 221–241.

Budde, Dagmar, 2010, Child Deities, in: Jacco Dieleman and Willeke Wendrich (eds.), *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*, Los Angeles. http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz0025sr1m (last accessed: 1 June 2024).

Budde, Dagmar, Sandra Sandri, and Ursula Verhoeven (eds.), 2003, *Kindgötter im Ägypten der griechisch-römischen Zeit. Zeugnisse aus Stadt und Tempel als Spiegel des interkulturellen Kontakts* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 128), Leuven.

Chassinat, Émile, 1939, *Le Mammisi d'Edfou* (MIFAO 16), Le Caire.
Clark, Susanne, 2007, *Etruskische Elfenbein- und Beinarbeiten der orientalisierenden und früharchaischen Zeit*, Erlangen (Diss.).
Clarysse, Willy, 2007, A Royal Journey in the Delta in 257 BC and the Date of the Mendes Stele: *Chronique d'Égypte* 82, 201–206.
Crowfoot, John W. and Grace M. Crowfoot, 1938, *Early Ivories from Samaria. Samaria-Sebaste II*, London.
Dasen, Véronique, 2008, Art. Pataikos, in: Jürg Eggler and Christoph Uehlinger (eds.), *Iconography of Deities and Demons – Electronic Pre-Publication*. http://www.religionswissenschaft.uzh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_pataikos.pdf (last accessed: 1 June 2024).
Dubiel, Ulrike, 2008, *Amulette, Siegel und Perlen. Studien zu Typologie und Tragesitte im Alten und Mittleren Reich* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 229), Fribourg/Göttingen.
Dunand, Françoise, 1990, *Catalogue des terres cuites gréco-romaines d'Égypte*, Paris.
Dvorjetski, Estée, 1994, "Zrifa in Askalon": A Talmudic Reality in the Art of Fine Metal Work in Eretz-lsrael in the Roman and Byzantine Periods: *Tarbiz* 63, 5–37 (Hebrew).
Edrey, Meir, 2008, The Dog Burials at Achaemenid Ashkelon Revisited: *Tel Aviv* 35, 267–282.
Efron, Joshua, 1990, *The Deed of Simeon ben Shatah in Ascalon, Appendix to: Aryeh Kasher, Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-lsrael: Relations of the Jews in Eretz Israel with the Hellenistic Cities during the Second Temple Period (332 BCE–70 CE)*, Tübingen, 336–337.
El-Khachab, Abd el-Mohsen, 1971, Some Gem-Amulets Depicting Harpocrates Seated on a Lotus Flower: To the Memory of My Great Friend Dr. Alexandre Piankoff: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 57, 132–145.
Fazzini, Richard A., 1988, *Egypt Dynasty XXII–XXV*, Leiden et al.
Ferron, Jean, 1971, La inscripción cartaginesa en el Arpocrates madrileños: *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 28, 359–379.
Ferron, Jean, 1973, Horus l'enfant sur les stèles votives de Carthage: *Revue de l'Institut des Belles-Lettres arabes* XXXVI/131, 79–96.
Ferron, Jean, 1974, La statuette d'Harpocrate du British Museum: *Rivista di Studi Fenici* 2, 77–95.
Feucht, Erika, 1984, Verjüngung und Wiedergeburt: *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 11, 401–417.
Foucher, Alfred, 1905, *L'art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhāra* (Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient 5), Paris.
Frankfurter, David, 2004, The Binding of Antelopes. A Coptic Frieze and its Egyptian Religious Context: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 63, 97–109.

Friedländer, Paul, 1912, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius. Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit*, Leipzig/Berlin 1912.

Fuks, Gideon, 2000, A Mediterranean Pantheon: Cults and Deities in Hellenistic and Roman Ashkelon: *Mediterranean Historical Review* 15/2, 27–48.

Golenischeff, Wladimir S., 1877, *Die Metternichstele in der Originalgröße*, Leipzig.

Guirguis, Fatin Morris, 2010, *The Vision of Theophilus: Resistance through Orality among the Persecuted Copts*, Boca Raton.

Häfner, Gerd, 2005, Die „Sonnenfrau" im Himmel und ihr Kind (Offb 12). Ein altes Rätsel neu bedacht: *Münchner Theologische Zeitschrift* 56, 113–133.

Haussherr, Reiner, 1970, Art. Jesuskind, in: Engelbert Kirschbaum (ed.), *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie Bd. 2*, 400–406.

Head, Barclay Vincent, [2]1967, *Historia Nummorum: A Manual of Greek Numismatics*, Chicago.

Heltzer, Michael, 1998, On the Vth Century BCE Dogs from Ashkelon: *Transeuphratène* 15, 149–152.

Henig, Martin, 1975, *The Lewis Collection of Engraved Gemstones in Corpus Christi College*, Cambridge.

Henig, Martin et al., 1994, *Classical Gems: Ancient and Modern Intaglios and Cameos in the Fitzwilliam Museum*, Cambridge.

Herrmann, Christian, 1985, *Formen für ägyptische Fayencen. Katalog der Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg/Schweiz und einer Privatsammlung* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 60), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Herrmann Christian, 1994, *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Mit einem Ausblick auf ihre Rezeption durch das Alte Testament* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 138), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Herrmann Christian, 2007, Weitere ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästinavereins* 123, 93–132.

Herrmann, Christian and Thomas Staubli, 2010, *1001 Amulett. Altägyptischer Zauber, monotheisierte Talismane, säkulare Magie*, Fribourg.

Hill, Marsha, 2014, Tribal Dynamics, Child Gods, Festivals, and the Faraway Goddess: Mingling in the Egyptian Delta in the Third Intermediate Period, in: Joan Aruz et al. (eds.), *Assyria to Iberia at the Dawn of the Classical Age*, New Haven, 154–167.

Hölbl, Günther, 1986, *Ägyptisches Kulturgut im phönikischen und punischen Sardinien*, Leiden.

Hölbl, Günther, 1989, Ägyptische Kunstelemente im phönikischen Kulturkreis des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.: Zur Methodik ihrer Verwendung: *Orientalia NS* 58, 318–325.

Iliffe, John H., 1936, A Hoard of Bronze from Askalon: *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 5, 61–68.

Ippel, Albert, 1940, *Wirkungen griechischer Kunst in Asien* (Der Alte Orient 39), Leipzig.

Jansen-Winkeln, Karl, 2006, Die Libyer in Herakleopolis Magna: *Orientalia* 75, 297–316.

Jung, Carl G. and Karl Kerényi, [4]1951, *Das göttliche Kind in mythologischer und psychologischer Beleuchtung*, Zürich.

Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig, 1965, Puer exoriens: On the Hypapante in the Mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore, in: id.: *Selected studies*, Locust Valley, 25–36.

Keel, Othmar, 1992, Ägyptische Baumgöttinnen der 18.–21. Dynastie. Bild und Wort, Wort und Bild, in: id., *Das Recht der Bilder, gesehen zu werden. Drei Fallstudien zur Methode der Interpretation altorientalischer Bilder* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 122), Fribourg/Göttingen, 61–138.

Keel, Othmar, 1997, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Band I: Von Tell Abu Farağ bis 'Atlit* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 13), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar, 2009, Seth-Baal und Seth-Baal-Jahwe – interkulturelle Ligaturen, in: Gerd Theissen et al. (eds.), *Jerusalem und die Länder. Ikonographie – Topographie – Theologie. FS Max Küchler* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 70), Göttingen, 87–107.

Keel, Othmar, 2010, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel Eton* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 29), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar, and Christoph Uehlinger, [6]2010, *Göttinnen, Götter und Gottessymbole. Neue Erkenntnisse zur Religionsgeschichte Kanaans und Israels aufgrund bislang unerschlossener ikonographischer Quellen* (Quaestiones Disputatae 134), Freiburg et al.

Keesling, Catherine M., 2005, Misunderstood Gestures: Iconatrophy and the Reception of Greek Sculpture in the Roman Imperial Period: *Classical Antiquity* 24, 41–79.

Khawam Roger, 1971, Un ensemble de moules en terre-cuite de la 19ème dynastie: *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 70, 133–160.

Kitchen, Kenneth, 1969–70, Two Donation Stelae in The Brooklyn Museum: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 8, 59–67.

Krug, Antje, 1995, Excursus: A Priest of Sarapis at Ascalon?, in: John H. Humphrey (ed.), *The Roman and Byzantine Near East: Some Recent Archaeological Research*, Ann Arbor, 135–138.

Kügler, Joachim, 1997, *Pharao und Christus? Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Frage einer Verbindung zwischen altägyptischer Königstheologie und neutestamentlicher Christologie im Lukasevangelium*, Bodenheim.

Lafaye, Georges, 1900, Art. Harpocrates, in: Charles Daremberg and Edmond Saglio (eds.), *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments*, tome 3, 12–13.

Le Coq, Albert von, 1926, *Auf Hellas Spuren*, Leipzig.

Lembke, Katja, 2012, Interpretatio Aegyptiaca vs. Interpretatio Graeca? Der ägyptische Staat und seine Denkmäler in der Ptolemäerzeit: *Mediterraneo antico* 14/1–2, 1–17.

Lombardi, Chiara, 2011/12, Affinità iconografiche e differenze ideologiche tra la rappresentazione di Harpocrates e le figure infantili dell'arte centro-asiatica: https://www.academia.edu/5246644 (last accessed: 1 June 2024).

Loukianoff, Gregoire, 1930–31, Le dieu Ched. L'évolution de son culte dans l'ancienne Égypte: *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte* 13, 67–84.

Luz, Ulrich, [5]2002, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1–7)* (Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament I/7), Düsseldorf et al.

Markoe, Glenn, 1985, *Phoenician Bronze and Silver Bowls from Cyprus and the Mediterranean*, Berkeley.

Matthey, Philippe, 2011, «Chut!» Le signe d'Harpocrate et l'invitation au silence, in: Francesca Prescendi and Youri Volokhine (eds.), *Dans le laboratoire de l'historien des religions. Mélanges offerts à Philippe Borgeaud*, Genève, 541–573.

McCarter Jr., P. Kyle, 1993, An Inscribed Phoenician Funerary Situla in the Art Museum of Princeton University: *BASOR* 290–291, 115–120.

Meeks, Dimitri, 2010, Art. Harpocrates. in: Jürg Eggler and Christoph Uehlinger (eds.), *Iconography of Deities and Demons – Electronic Pre-Publication*. http://www.religionswissenschaft.uzh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_harpocrates.pdf (last accessed: 1 June 2024).

Merkelbach, Reinhold, 1992, *Abrasax. Ausgewählte Papyri religiösen und magischen Inhalts, Band 3: Zwei griechisch-ägyptische Weihezeremonien. Die Leidener Weltschöpfung – Die Pschai-Aion-Liturgie* (Papyrologica Coloniensia XVII.3), Opladen.

Merkelbach, Reinhold, 1995, *Isis regina – Zeus Sarapis*, Stuttgart/Leipzig.

Michel, Simone, 2001, *Die magischen Gemmen im Britischen Museum*, London.

Michel, Simone, 2004, *Die magischen Gemmen. Zu Bildern und Zauberformeln auf geschnittenen Steinen der Antike und Neuzeit* (Studien aus dem Warburg-Haus 7), Berlin.

Moje, Jan, 2014, *Herrschaftsräume und Herrschaftswissen ägyptischer Lokalregenten* (Topoi 21), Berlin/Boston.

Morenz, Siegfried and Johannes Schubert, 1954, *Der Gott auf der Blume. Eine ägyptische Kosmogonie und ihre weltweite Bildwirkung*, Ascona.

Mourad, Anna-Latifa, 2015, *Rise of the Hyksos. Egypt and the Levant from the Middle Kingdom to the Early Second Intermediate Period* (Archaeopress Egyptology 11), Oxford.

Mourad, Anna-Latifa, 2019–21, *The Enigma of the Hyksos. Vol. 2: Transforming Egypt into the New Kingdom. The Impact of the Hyksos and Egyptian-Near Eastern Relations* (Contributions to the Archaeology of Egypt, Nubia and the Levant 10), Wiesbaden.

Nachtergael, Georges, 1991, Die Terrakotten des griechisch-römischen Ägypten – eine Einführung, in: Cornelia Ewigleben and Jochen von Grumbkow (eds.), *Götter, Gräber und Grotesken. Tonfiguren aus dem Alltagsleben im römischen Ägypten* (Bilderhefte des Museums für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg 25), Hamburg, 19–24.

Németh, György, 2010, Jewish Elements in the Greek Magic of Pannonia: *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 1, 181–188.

Nielsen, Nicky, Valentina Gasperini, and Mandy Mamedow, 2016, Preliminary Report on the First Season of the Tell Nabasha Project, Autumn 2015: *Ägypten und Levante* 26, 65–74.

Palistrant Shaick, Ronit, 2012, Who is Standig Above the Lions in Ascalon?: *Israel Numismatic Research* 7, 127–146.

Perrot, Georges and Charles Chipiez, 1885, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité, tome 3: Phénicie – Cypre*, Paris.

Quaegebeur, Jan, 1987, Une statue égyptienne représentant Héraclès-Melqart?, in: Édouard Lipiński (ed.), *Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Millennium B.C. Proceedings of the Conference held in Leuven from the 14th to the 16th of November 1985* (Studia Phoenicia 5; Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 22), Leuven, 157–166.

Quaegebeur, Jan, 1989, The Egyptian Clergy and the Cult of the Ptolemaic Dynasty: *Ancient Society* 20, 93–116.

Rondot, Vincent, 2013, *Derniers visages des dieux d'Égypte. Iconographies, panthéons et cultes dans le Fayoum hellénisé des II^e^–III^e^ siècles de notre ère*, Paris.

Sader, Hélène, 1990, Deux épigraphes phéniciennes inédites: *Syria 67*, 315–322.

Safrai, Ze'ev, 1984, Fairs in the Land of Israel in the Mishna and Talmud Period: *Zion* 49, 139–158 (Hebrew).

Sandri, Sandra, 2006, *Harpachered (Harpokrates). Die Genese eines ägyptischen Götterkindes* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 151), Leuven.

Schlegelmilch, Sabine, 2009, *Bürger, Gott und Götterschützling. Kinderbilder der hellenistischen Kunst und Literatur*, Berlin.

Schlögl, Hermann, 1977, *Der Sonnengott auf der Blüte. Eine ägyptische Kosmogonie des Neuen Reiches* (Aegyptiaca Helvetica 5), Basel/Genève.

Schmitz, Philip C., 2002, Reconsidering a Phoenician Inscribed Amulet from the Vicinity of Tyre: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122, 817–823.
Schreiber, Stefan, 2010, Der jüdische Messias in Windeln: *Welt und Umwelt der Bibel* 58, 24–25.
Schroer, Silvia, 2011, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient. Eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern. Band 3: Die Spätbronzezeit*, Fribourg.
Schroer, Silvia, 2018, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient. Eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern. Band 4: Die Eisenzeit bis zum Beginn der achämenidischen Herrschaft*, Basel.
Skuse, Matthew L., 2017, Coregency in the Reign of Ptolemy II: Findings from the Mendes Stela: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 103, 89–101.
Śliwa, Joachim, 2013, Magical Amulet from Paphos with the ιαεω-Palindrome: *Studies in Ancient Art and Civilization* 17, 293–300.
Stadler, Martin Andreas, 2004, *Isis, das Göttliche Kind und die Weltordnung*, Wien.
Stadler, Martin Andreas, 2006, Isis würfelt nicht: *Studi di Egittologia e di Papirologia* 3, 187–203.
Stager, Lawrence E., 1991, Why Were Hundreds of Dogs Buried at Ashkelon?: *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17/3, 26–42.
Staubli, Thomas and Silvia Schroer, 2014, *Menschenbilder der Bibel*, Ostfildern.
Staubli, Thomas, 1991, *Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 107), Fribourg/Göttingen.
Staubli, Thomas, 2010, Art. Reiten/Reiter, Das Wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet.
http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/33122 (last accessed: 1 June 2024).
Staubli, Thomas, 2014a, Die kanaanäische Vegetationsfrömmigkeit und ihr Fortleben in Judentum, Christentum und Islam, in palästinischer Volkskultur und säkularer Staatsemblematik. Neue Einsichten aus der Ikonographie der Südlevante, in: Michaela Bauks and Michael F. Meyer (eds.), *Zur Kulturgeschichte der Botanik*, Trier, 73–106.
Staubli, Thomas, 2014b, Land of Sprouting Twigs: Vertical ecumenism in Palestinian art and culture, in: Mitri Raheb (ed.), *Palestinian Identity in Relation to Time and Space*, Bethlehem, 121–134.255–263.
Staubli, Thomas, 2016, Cultural and Religious Impacts of Long-Term Cross-Cultural Migration Between Egypt and the Levant: *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 12, 50–88.
Stefana, Cristea, 2013, Egyptian, Greek, Roman Harpocrates – A Protecting and Saviour God, in: Iulian Moga, *Angels, Demons and Representations of Afterlife within the Jewish, Pagan and Christian Imagery*, Iași, 73–86.

Sternberg-El Hotabi, Heike, 1989, Horusstele des Anchpachėred, Sohn des Djedheriuefanch, Museum of Fine Arts Boston (Nr. 05.90): *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 16, 275–287.

Sternberg-El Hotabi, Heike, 1999, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Horusstelen* (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 62), Wiesbaden.

Stucky, Rolf A., 1993, *Die Skulpturen aus dem Eschmun-Heiligtum bei Sidon*, Basel.

Tomoum, Nadja Samir, 2005, *The Sculptors' Models of the Late and Ptolemaic Periods: A Study of the Type and Function of a Group of Ancient Egyptian Artefacts*, Cairo.

Ward, William E., 1952, The Lotus Symbol: Its Meaning in Buddhist Art and Philosophy: *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 11/2, 135–146.

Weiss, Katja, 2012, *Ägyptische Tier- und Götterbronzen aus Unterägypten. Untersuchungen zu Typus, Ikonographie und Funktion sowie der Bedeutung innerhalb der Kulturkontakte zu Griechenland* (Ägypten und Altes Testament 81), Mainz.

Wicke, Dirk, 2010, Die Goldschale der Iabâ – eine levantinische Antiquität: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 100, 109–141.

Wiese, André B., 1996, *Die Anfänge der ägyptischen Stempelsiegel-Amulette. Eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur den „Knopfsiegeln" und verwandten Objekten der 6. bis frühen 12. Dynastie* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 12), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Willers, Dietrich and Lilian Raselli-Nydegger (eds.), 2003, *Im Glanz der Götter und Heroen. Meisterwerke antiker Glyptik aus der Stiftung Leo Merz*, Mainz.

Yamazaki, Naoko, 2003, *Zaubersprüche für Mutter und Kind: Papyrus Berlin 3027*, Berlin.

Yoyotte, Jean et al., 1960, *Pèlerinages: Égypte ancienne, Israël, Islam, Perse, Inde, Tibet, Indonésie, Madagascar, Chine, Japon* (Sources orientales 3), Paris.

Zivie-Coche, Christiane and Françoise Dunand, 2013, *Die Religionen des Alten Ägypten*, Stuttgart.

Zwierlein-Diehl, Erika, 1992, *Magische Amulette und andere Gemmen des Instituts für Altertumskunde der Universität zu Köln*, Opladen.

ON HEADGEARS, BEARDS, AND CLOTHES: REEVALUATING TYPOLOGICAL INDICATORS IN THE CASE OF SOUTHERN LEVANTINE FIGURINES FROM PERSIAN AND EARLY HELLENISTIC TIMES

Christian Frevel and Katharina Pyschny[1]

This paper focuses on two kinds of terracotta figurines, the so-called bearded man and the woman and child figurines, with special emphasis on the intersection of regional variances and typological indicators. By challenging the East-West paradigm, the interpretation opens up for regional and temporal continuities or discontinuities. In discussing the notion of Hellenization against the background of the concept of hybridity, this paper aims at a more appropriate typological approach beyond dichotomies. Hoards from the coastal region, the Shephelah, and the region of Idumea, as well as their parallels from Phoenician sites such as Achzib and Kharayeb, attest to a rather transitional character of the evidence in temporal and iconographical respect. The variance in typology, style, motif, and material production demonstrates a certain amount of "hybridization" driven by contact, trade, fashion, and cultural influence.

1. Introductory and Methodological Remarks

Following the most influential book on the material culture of the Persian period of the late Ephraim Stern, terracotta figurines are categorized not only in regard to their techniques of manufacture,[2] but predominantly on the basis of their style. "Stylistically the figurines fall into two main classes which present men and

[1] This essay is based on a paper given in 2017 at a conference at the University of Bern. We would like to thank Silvia Schroer and Patrick Wyssmann for the invitation to this conference and all their editorial efforts linked to the present volume. This essay benefited a lot from a research stay in Jerusalem and we would like to express our gratitidue to the *École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem* for granting us access to the library. Many thanks are due to Christopher Ryan Jones and Johannes Bergmann for their support in editing this essay.

[2] Based on the finds from Tel Ẓippor, Stern distinguished three groups in accordance with Negbi 1966: (1) hollow terracottas, (2) solid terracottas, and (3) partly hollow, partly solid terracottas (see Stern 1982: 165). As will be discussed below, the techniques of manufacture also play a certain role for the West-East paradigm. From the perspective of research history, Negbi's study on the assemblage of terracotta figurines from Tel Ẓippor was – and to some degree still is – crucial for establishing this paradigm.

women in Eastern or Western style."[3] While the figurines of the Western group are rather uniform in style and predominantly characterized by a Greek dress or style,[4] the Eastern group is marked by numerous stylistic influences – Phoenician, Egyptian, Persian, or Babylonian. This basic distinction between the two groups, which has been adopted by many scholars in the field,[5] bears (more or less explicitly) some significant assumptions and implications on different levels. Let us highlight four important aspects:

(a) Although the West-East paradigm[6] is applied to the evidence from the Iron Age IIB onwards, it draws upon a diametrical dichotomy between Phoenician and Hellenistic traditions in cultural-historical respect. It follows or presupposes a rather problematic reconstruction of Greek-Phoenician contacts,[7] which does not do justice to evidence like, for instance, the seals from ʿAtlit depicting Heracles in an ancient Near Eastern or Phoenician style (e.g., smiting pose).[8] Also, the Persian period bullae from Wadi ed-Daliyeh[9] and the sealings from the Hellenistic archive in Tel Kedesh[10] (and most recently Maresha[11]), and even the ceramic evidence attest to processes of acculturation and hybridization. As Eric M. Meyers states concerning the Persian period, "Greek cultural influence rose steadily, as reflected in the import of Greek Attic pottery"[12] which was distributed by lots of traders beginning with the 6th century BCE and was soon imitated by local potters.[13] Considering the material culture of Persian and early Hellenistic times, it becomes evident that the East-West paradigm is far too simple to

[3] Stern 1982: 165. See also idem 1984: 104–105; 2001: 490–505.

[4] "All of these figurines are rendered in a pure Greek style, and their subjects as well are generally taken from the world of Greek religion" (Stern 1982: 172).

[5] To name but a few, see the numerous publications on figurines by Izak Cornelius, Adi Erlich, and Eilat Mazar.

[6] In this essay, we use the term "West-East paradigm" as a short reference to Stern's distinction between Eastern and Western figurines.

[7] For new models to conceptualize Hellenization and to reconstruct Greek-Phoenician contacts, see Martin 2007 and Martin 2017.

[8] See Frevel and Pyschny 2016: 117–118.

[9] For the highly pluriform character of the bullae, see Leith 1997; Keel 2010a; Schroer and Lippke 2014.

[10] See Herbert 2003.

[11] The large private Hellenistic archive of Maresha was discovered in 2018 by Ian Stern but is not published yet. As far as the iconography of the ca. 1000 bullae or sealings is concerned, the preliminary reports hint at a similar "hybrid" character as at Tel Kedesh.

[12] Meyers and Chancey 2012: 3.

[13] For a reassessment of Attic imports and their impact on identity discourses in Israel/Palestine, see Nunn 2014. See also the part on Attic pottery in Palestine in Betlyon 2005: 24–25 written by S. Rebecca Martin: "So far from the variety of Attic vessels, we can see that Levantine consumers chose what suited their tastes and needs, combining an interest in fine Greek goods – and perhaps Greek practices – with local traditions" (25). For an emphasis on the cross-cultural transmission and mutual exchange evaluated based on the archaic Greek pottery, see, e.g., Fletcher 2011: 36: "Cultures in the Mediterranean learned from the East, but Eastern cultures also learned from the West."

draw an adequate picture[14] and that such a clear dichotomy underestimates the complex cultural interactions between Phoenician and Hellenistic traditions.[15] While the so-called Orientalizing paradigm has undergone trenchant ideological critique since Edward W. Said's initial argument,[16] the East-West paradigm in regard to Southern Levantine figurines remained mostly unchanged.

(b) Linked to the figurines' distribution and parallels,[17] the proposed classification bears a remarkable implication in regard to their origins. Namely, that Eastern figurines were made locally, while the Western ones were "either truly imported or made locally from imported moulds"[18] in imitation of Greek style. Especially the latter notion is highly challenged by the finds from Idumea (e.g., Maresha), which clearly show that Eastern style figurines might have been influenced by Western traditions in regard to general iconography, but remained local in style and technique (e.g., standing woman with child seated on the left shoulder, see below).[19] The transitional period between the late Persian and early Hellenistic period is rather characterized by hybridization in terms of style as is evidenced, for instance, by the figurine repertoire of Kharayeb,[20] where the assemblage from the Persian period consists of local types like horsemen or pregnant women and at the same time of figurines influenced by Oriental Greek style (e.g., figurines dressed in a chiton). "In the Persian period the figurines with Greek iconography are inserted in a context where the local tradition of style and iconography are still alive."[21] Thus, Greek (and Egyptian) elements have been

[14] Interestingly enough, Ephraim Stern himself seems to be aware of the problem when he states in regard to a group of male deities in Greek style from Dor, "the 'Greek' style of these figures … should not mislead us for they also display many details that are absent in the Greek and Cypriot prototypes and, in our opinion, it would not be an exaggeration to assume that these are also of Phoenician origin. It is therefore possible that these blessing figurines, represent a 'Western' version of the Eastern 'ruling god,' like the 'warrior god' horsemen … – both the Eastern and the Western" (Stern 2010: 8).

[15] See Çakmak 2009, especially the conclusion, in which she states that the bullae or seals "cannot simply be taken as purely Greek or purely indigenous, but rather as an entirely 'new whole' that reflects the varied nature of the people living in and around Tel Kedesh in the late Hellenistic period. These 'new' or hybrid images themselves, reflect the identities of the individual users and the community of Kedesh at large" (171).

[16] See, e.g., Feldman 2019: 373–374.

[17] While Eastern style figurines are found in almost all regions of the Southern Levant, but not on the Aegean Islands or in Greece, the Western group resembles characteristic types and styles of the Aegean or Greek world (see Stern 1984: 104).

[18] Stern 1982: 105 in reference to the figurines from Tel Ẓippor. Negbi 1966: 6: "The style and distribution of the terracottas and statuettes of both groups appear to indicate that those belonging to the western group are imported, while those belonging to the eastern group are local".

[19] See Erlich 2006: 54.

[20] The rural shrine of Kharayeb is located in the hinterland of Tyre (approximately 15 km to the north). A favissa yielded more than 1100 figurines dating from the 7th/5th to the 1st century BCE (see Oggiano 2015b; Castiglione 2019).

[21] Oggiano 2015b: 516–517.

integrated into local traditions, indicating a slow gradual process of cultural change ("hybrid art"). As stated by Marianna Castiglione, "Greek and Egyptian influences became more and more visible, due to their polysemic values which made them immediately accessible to different social or ethnic groups, but at the same time the Phoenician traditions maintained their strength."[22] Although style and iconography changed remarkably during the Hellenistic period in Kharayeb – inasmuch that depictions of commoners in Greek style become predominant – the evidence attests to standardization rather than cultural othering. These kinds of mixed phenomena and varying complexity in origin, style, and iconography cannot be described adequately by the East-West paradigm.

(c) When it comes to processes of cultural transformation, innovation, change, and synthesis, terminology is still a sensitive issue since almost every term to describe these processes has been questioned in cultural studies. This holds especially true when the issue at hand is related to ethnicity, culture, or identity. In regard to figurines, the discussion can be considered a sub-type of the "pots and people" discourse on ethnicity and material culture.[23]

Many terms have been suggested to describe processes of cultural transformation, however, we will only mention a selection of them, such as mixture, ambiguity, heterogeneity, pastiche, hybridity, creolization, mestizaje, métissage, amalgam, fusion, conglomerate, transculturality, and syncretism. These terms are often coined in the context of conceptualizing modernity or modern plurality and are therefore often biased. Hence, Claudia Radermacher considers them ambivalently "magic words of global postmodernism" ("Zauberwörter der globalen Postmoderne").[24] It is not by chance that so many different terms are used to describe cultural flux, cultural entanglement, and the result of cultural encounter. Epistemic oscillation is no surprise in postmodern contexts, which are characterized by the avoidance of fixed meanings, by unhistorical essentializations, or by the defining power of discourses. Each and every concept has its fallacies as well as its advantages. To give only some examples, while "mixture" seems to assume that the entities brought together do not merge and keep their original belonging, "ambiguity" in contrast marks the indecisiveness of the new and the problem of assigning it properly. However, the term "fusion" denotes a created "new" that no longer allows for the identifying of the origin, since they are completely merged into something new. "Heterogeneity" stresses disunity and inconsistency; it emphasizes otherness and addresses something "beyond," yet it is always in need of something to which the "new" is heterogenous. "Hybridity" is something in between and one

[22] Castiglione 2019: 368. See also Bisi 1990: 80.
[23] See McInerney 2014.
[24] Radermacher 1999: 258.

of the critical aspects is its problematic relation to the ideal counterpart "purity." "Syncretism" is a loaded term particularly in religious contexts because it presumes (in a way comparable to "hybridization") a "pure" paradigm in the background, which is often associated with a concept of orthodoxy or orthopraxy. As previously stated, any of these terms has disadvantages which cannot be completely avoided, but it is much more important to be aware of this than to search for a neutral non-biased term.

The critique of these terms has one common ground, namely that any attempt to essentialize the "new" is met with deep skepticism. The fluidity and the abolition of clear-cut boundaries is characteristic of these concepts because they long for alternatives to unilinear models of acculturation. The description of material culture has profited a lot from the concept of hybridity, which was introduced or, more precisely, prominently discussed in Homi Bhabha's seminal work on globalization "The Location of Culture."[25] While this concept has a certain relation to the post-colonial approach, it was often questioned especially when it was applied to other fields of study.[26] However, by stressing the overlapping and entanglement of cultures, rather than their diametrical opposition, the term has clear advantages[27] and might be helpful in describing the encounter of East and West in Persian and early Hellenistic times. The idea of Hellenization, which always lurks behind this issue, is also relativized by the use of "hybridization," if one is aware of the pitfalls provided by the related counter concept of "purity."[28]

(d) Even though Stern developed his distinction on the basis of Persian period figurines alone, it also bears a significant implication in chronological respect. It stresses the assumed clear-cut break between Persian and early Hellenistic times. While the Eastern type is explained in continuity to the Iron Age figurines and cultural contexts, the Western type is interpreted as disruptive towards the local style or proleptic in terms of Hellenistic culture. Such a notion is highly disputed on the basis of the material culture which reveals this time frame as a period of transition rather than radical change. Let us emphasize one relevant aspect in terms of chronology. The East-West paradigm draws on a presumably clear chronology, as evidenced by the following statement given by Ephraim Stern:

[25] See Bhabha 1994.

[26] See Stockhammer 2012.

[27] See Mackenthun 2010.

[28] This long preliminary remark on terminology was not intended to address the conceptual debate on globalization and post-colonial approaches in general. It was also not intended to settle the terminological questions, but rather to demonstrate that the discussion about the West-East paradigm in the classification of figurines and its criticism has a broader background in recent discussions within cultural studies.

> "Comparison of the western type of figurines with their parallels in the lands of origin (that is, Rhodos, Cyprus and Greece) reveals that, like the stone statuettes, most are to be dated to the end of the sixth century and the fifth century B.C.E. alone. Only a few types continue into the first half of the fourth century B.C.E. The dates of the eastern group, most of whose types are found only in Palestine and Phoenicia, are less firmly established. The chronological range determined for most of them is from the end of the sixth century down to the fourth century B.C.E. Since, however, they were found together with Cypriot and western figurines, it is evident that they are all of the same period, though their production in Palestine may have continued later into the fourth century B.C.E., down to the end of the Persian period."[29]

However, the differences in style do not appear sequentially in the sense of the Western figurines always being the later ones. Especially in late Persian and early Hellenistic times, Eastern and Western styled figurines are contemporaneous, made from the same (local) clay and most probably produced by the same craftsmen. Further, as indicated by pottery[30] and figurines (e.g., Maresha),[31] Persian period types of figurines most likely remained in use in early Hellenistic times.[32]

In light of these insights, Stern's distinction between two groups of figurines seems far too simple to describe the material culture of the late Persian and early Hellenistic period. There are no clear-cut lines between Eastern and Western groups, neither in typological nor iconographic respect. Instead, we face a complex situation of various regional trends including processes of typological and iconographic adaptations, intersections, innovations, etc. Against this background, our paper aims to reevaluate typological indicators using Persian and early Hellenistic terracotta figurines as a case study. After a rough overview on quantity, distribution, and types, we will give two examples of typological or iconographic intersections between East and West, examining the bearded man figurines on the one hand and the woman and child figurines[33] on the other. Finally, this essay will end with some synthesizing remarks and broader conclusions highlighting the rather transitional character of Persian and early Hellenistic figurines in chronological, typological, and iconographic respect as well as their link to processes of hybridization driven by contact, trade, and cultural influences.

[29] Stern 1984: 104.

[30] We would like to thank Débora Sandhaus-Reem for the dicussion on Persian and (early) Hellenistic pottery.

[31] See Erlich 2006: 46.

[32] Ibid.

[33] In this essay, we prefer the term "woman and child" over "mother and child figurine" in order to avoid a premature interpretation of the female figure as the child's mother (see below).

2. Terracotta Figurines in Persian (and early Hellenistic) Israel/Palestine: Some Notes on Types, Quantity, and Distribution

The attempt to paint an adequate picture of the highly complex state of affairs concerning the quantity and distribution of Persian and early Hellenistic figurines in Israel/Palestine is without doubt a Herculean effort. Due to the restricted frame of an essay, the following remarks should not be considered an all-encompassing description of the find situation but rather a rough mapping of the most important sites with special emphasis on hoards and assemblages of figurines.[34] The following overview is structured according to regional rather than political "borders,"[35] proceeding from North to South and from West to East.[36] Focusing on figurines dating to the time frame of the 6th to the 3rd century BCE, the remarks stick foremost to the simple typological differentiation between male and female figurines in order to avoid a premature determination in regard to typology.[37] For the same reason they are presented in a rather descriptive way and refrain from interpretation.

Although we are aware of the creeping processes of homogenization, if not to say standardization, of the Southern Levant and the Phoenician heartland,[38] our interest is rather in regionalization within these processes. Leaving aside Phoenician sites such as Achzib, Kharayeb, or the hoards from the sea near Shavei Ẓion and Tyre, we would like to highlight three sites from *the coastal region* which yielded remarkable assemblages of figurines from Persian and early Hellenistic times. One of the most important hoard findings stems from Dor, where most of the figurines were discovered in two large groups – both of which were found in pits (area B and area C).[39] Though no traces of a sanctuary survived,

[34] Due to the topic of this essay, special interest is given to sites in which bearded man and woman and child figurines have been found and which yielded assemblages of figurines including both Eastern and Western types. The following overview includes only finds from (published) excavations. Only in some exceptional cases do we refer to (published) objects from museums stemming from the antiquities market.

[35] Regional names like Idumea or the like are used as a heuristic tool in full awareness of the fluidity of borders in geographical, topographical, and especially political respect. For the distribution of figurines, see the map below and the groundbreaking remarks by Stern 1982: 158–182.

[36] The area of Transjordan is left out due to pragmatic reasons and to the restricted space of this essay. However, there can be no doubt that a more thorough analysis would need to include the Transjordanian evidence as well as a comparative perspective (esp. Cyprus).

[37] For the sake of our argument we comment on whether the figurines are Western or Eastern types according to Stern's East-West paradigm.

[38] See Bisi 1990: 76–77: "Cette standardisation n'interdit pas, toutefois, la caractérisation régionale de certains types" (76).

[39] For more details, see most recently Straßburger 2018: 241–260.

these pits are interpreted as favissae.[40] While the assemblage of area B consists of Eastern style figurines and plaques only,[41] the assemblage of the favissa in area C, dating to the end of the 5th century BCE, includes mostly figurines in archaic Greek style (male heads – either bareheaded or wearing headgear – with pointed beards, an "archaic smile," and a young maiden). However, with one object depicting a nude female holding her breasts, the assemblage attests also to Eastern traditions.[42]

In Apollonia-Arsuf, fragments of male and female figurines are of particular interest. Located in the northwestern part of the modern city of Herzliya, the Persian period occupation is mainly represented by four phases of settlement and a large deposit of pottery. Of special interest are the fragments of male and female figurines found in area H and in the refuse pit.[43] At least two of them depict bearded men, one with an atef-crown and the other with a flat hat and a bent down mustache.[44] Together with these figurines, a naked torso, perhaps related to Apollo, has been found. Some fragments of Western style female figurines complement the finds, such as a torso of a chiton-wrapped female, a Western head and upper body, and a figurine in Egyptian style with swollen cheeks.

Another remarkable hoard of figurines (and statuettes) stems from Makmish. The objects date between the 5th and the 4th centuries BCE and were found in the remains of a sanctuary.[45] They vary in typological and stylistic respect including Western (e.g., Heracles figurine, crowned heads) and Eastern types (bearded man, pregnant woman, woman and child, nude female, etc.).

In comparison to the coastal plain and especially to the Shephelah and Idumea (see below), the quantity of Persian period figurines is significantly lower in the Galilee region, the province of Samaria and the province of Yehud. Hoards of terracotta figurines, comparable to, for instance, Dor, Tel Ẓippor, Tel Ḥalif, and Maresha[46] are not known from these regions. Instead, there are only a few sites in which terracotta figurines have been found.

In regard to the *Galilee region*,[47] we would like to mention some figurines from Dan, including "a woman carrying a child, a horse and rider, a Horus temple boy, two bronze representations of Osiris, … and the head of a goddess."[48]

[40] In this paper, we distinguish between favissae (pits with a more or less clear cultic character in which ritual objects have been buried) and deposits (pits without clear signs of cultic or ritual activity). For further discussion, see Martin 2007 and Straßburger 2018: 11–21.

[41] See Stern 1995.

[42] See ibid.

[43] See Roll and Tal 1999: 190.

[44] See Roll and Tal 1999: 191, Fig. 4.51.

[45] See Stern 1982: 158.

[46] For a recent discussion of the repertoires from Tel Ẓippor, Tel Ḥalif, and Maresha, see Erlich 2019a.

[47] For the history of settlement in the Persian period Galilee region, see Zwickel 2017.

[48] Biran 1994: 214.

The figurines, which typologically consist of Eastern and Western types, are believed to stem from a repository or a favissa. However, not much can be said about the nature of the sacred precinct in Persian times except that it continued to exist.[49] Leaving aside the hoard of bronzes from the hill sanctuary of Miẓpe Yammim and moving further south, we have to mention the terracotta figurines from Bethsaida (et-Tell),[50] which consist predominantly of nude and pregnant women. A tendency towards Eastern types was suggested by Stern addressing a number of (female) pillar figurines from Megiddo, which were discovered scattered on the mound and attributed to a Persian period stratum (525–332 BCE).[51] However, the date is not certain and the typological comparison to figurines from Idumea (e.g., Tel Ẓippor, Tel ʿErani) remains open for discussion. Furthermore, a small assemblage of figurines was found in Beth-Shean consisting of bearded men, pregnant women, and female nudes.[52] The exact findspot as well as the stratigraphic contexts are not certain. Ephraim Stern dated the figurines to the Persian period and considers them the content of a favissa.[53]

Following the trend of the late Iron Age, Persian period figurines are very rare in the provincial *region of Samaria* in general. A similar find situation can be detected in the *provincial region of Yehud*. Fragments from the City of David might hint at horse and rider figurines.[54] In addition, a few figurines are known from En-Gedi (pregnant woman and an Astarte in Greek style), Gibeon (horseman and female in Greek style), Jericho (horseman), Tell en-Naṣbeh (horseman) and Ramat Raḥel (horseman).[55] As far as the Galilee region, Samaria, and Yehud are concerned, the evidence is too scarce to provide significant insights for re-evaluating the typology of Persian and early Hellenistic terracotta figures. The situation changes immediately once we turn to the *Shephelah and Idumea*, where several sites yielded a remarkable amount of Persian period figurines including Tel Ẓafit, Tel Ẓippor, Tel ʿErani, Maresha, Lachish, Tel Ḥalif, and Beersheba. Each site has a broad typological range and almost all of them attest to both

[49] See ibid.

[50] See Skupinska-Løvset 2014 for the nude and pregnant women and Fortner 2008: 29–32 for the Hellenistic-Roman terracottas.

[51] See Stern 1982: 162.

[52] See Fitzgerald 1932: Plate XXIV.

[53] See Stern 1982: 158. Also see the new analysis of the female figurines by Skupinska-Løvset 2014.

[54] Although we cannot discuss this in detail here, we remain rather skeptical about the idea of a new type of figurine based on the evidence from the City of David, as argued by de Hulster 2017.

[55] See de Hulster 2017 building on Schmitt 2003.

Western and Eastern types.[56] The following remarks focus on the four most important hoards.[57]

A pit or deposit at Tel Ẓippor[58] revealed more than 200 terracotta figurines, of which only 118 have been published, depicting women (53), men (34), riders (23), and other types such as pillar figurines, woman and child figurines, and depictions of Hermes (8 in total).[59] The figurines have been dated to the Persian period (530–350 BCE) on the basis of technical and typological criteria.[60] All figurines are broken and the pit they were found in is often interpreted as a dump or a favissa.[61] Of the 107 items, 53 depict women. The types include nude women, pregnant women, woman and child figurines, bearded man figurines, horse and riders, and some Western style terracottas.

In Tel Ẓafit (Tell eṣ-Ṣafi/Gath)[62], around 100 fragments of terracotta figurines were found in the early excavations by Bliss and Macalister in a "rubbish heap" usually interpreted as a favissa. On the basis of the other objects found in the dump, the figurines have been dated to the span of 500–350 BCE.[63] Taken together, the stylistic and typological range of these objects is quite similar to the aforementioned finds from Tel Ẓippor including distinctive Eastern (e.g., female nude, pregnant women, horsemen, woman and child, bearded men) and Western (e.g., Aphrodite, Heracles, Greek warrior) style figurines as well as the combination of both.[64]

The ancient city of Maresha yielded hundreds of terracotta figurines, including approximately 600 Hellenistic, 100 Persian, and even fewer Iron Age ones.[65] They were found in the rich fills in the underground complexes so that their primary context and function is not certain but assumed to be domestic.[66] Since most figurines were found in mixed archaeological contexts, they are dated typologically rather than archaeologically. The types from the Persian period consist of Persian riders (55%), standing men with beard and cap (10–15%), and

[56] According to Erlich 2006, Maresha is the only exception since the Persian period figurines lack Greek types. However, Cornelius 2014 notes that some of the Persian period figurines from Maresha look rather Hellenistic.

[57] On Tel ʿErani, see Straßburger 2018: 233–236.

[58] For more details, see most recently Straßburger 2018: 229–233, who considers the deposit a (possible) favissa.

[59] See Negbi 1966: 3.

[60] Some of the figurines could be dated to the Iron Age and might have been linked to an earlier temple.

[61] Negbi 1966: 1: "… refuse pit or a favissa of some nearby sanctuary which has unfortunately disappeared as a result of the ploughing …".

[62] See also Straßburger 2018: 260–268.

[63] See Stern 1982: 158.

[64] See the table in Avissar, Uziel, and Maeir 2007.

[65] See Erlich 2006.

[66] This is drawn from the fact that the subterranean complexes are connected to the Hellenistic period houses above them (see Erlich 2006: 46).

females (predominantly woman and child, 15%).[67] As pointed out by Adi Erlich, certain types could have spanned more than one period, "… types which are considered to be from Persian period most likely remained in use at the beginning of the Hellenistic period".[68]

Finally, we have to mention Tel Ḥalif, where 794 fragments of terracotta figurines have been recovered from the western edge of the site. The terracottas date mostly to the Persian and Hellenistic periods and have been discovered in tertiary deposits of topsoil, construction fills, and backfills within trenches.[69] Except for eleven figurines found in primary context, the dating of the objects is grounded completely on typological indicators. Females predominantly include the Astarte type, pillar figurines, the dea gravida, and several variations of the woman and child figurine, etc. Male figurines appear, among others, in the types of bearded man and horse and rider figurines. Hellenistic motifs also occur, as evidenced by representations of Aphrodite, Heracles (or Perseus), and the woman with a raised torch.[70]

Based on this very rough and undoubtedly incomplete overview, we would like to comment on a few aspects which are particularly relevant for assessing Stern's East-West paradigm. It became evident that the distribution of figurines is simply not congruent with the regionally differentiated "Judaisms" we find in the 6th to the 3rd century BCE in Israel/Palestine.[71] As far as terracotta figurines are concerned, there is a clear concentration in the coastal area as well as the Shephelah and the region of Idumea. In addition, it is noteworthy that the sites differ drastically in regard to quantity and composition of figurines. This holds true even if one focuses exclusively on hoards,[72] but all the more if one considers the lower quantities of figurines from other sites as well (e.g., Apollonia-Arsuf). Without insinuating that the complex find distribution could be explained in a monocausal way, one cannot escape the impression that the find situation in terms of quantity, typological variety, and quality of production might be linked to economic factors. The coastal area, the Shephelah, and the region of Idumea are well integrated into ancient trade routes and as such these regions could easily establish and maintain connections with other countries, regions, cities, etc. However, it remains striking that other geographically well-connected places such as, for instance, Tell Jemmeh or Samaria, did not yield significant quantities

[67] See Erlich 2006: 46.

[68] Ibid.

[69] See Jacobs 2015: 4.

[70] See Jacobs 2015: 78.

[71] For tendencies of regionalization in Persian times and various "Judaisms" during this period, see Frevel, Pyschny, and Cornelius 2014.

[72] See, for instance, the difference in quantity between Makmish and Tel Ḥalif.

of figurines. In addition, compared to the Iron Age II, we face a growing significance of hoards and alleged cultic contexts of figurines.[73] Certainly, the general trend of increasing votive practice, which can be associated with the individualization of religious practice, might come into play here as well. However, the impression that the find contexts are almost exclusively restricted to temples, favissae, or other cultic contexts is not entirely true. Based on the given overview, at least some figurines hint at a private or domestic context of usage. This holds particularly true for the finds from Maresha and might be considered for the figurines from Apollonia-Arsuf as well.

When linking the given overview with Stern's East-West paradigm, it becomes noteworthy that Stern's classification of figurines is not reflected in the regional distribution (there are almost no sites with either Eastern or Western figurines exclusively) or the find contexts (there are no Western or Eastern specific find contexts). The latter aspect is difficult to assess, since most of the finds stem from pits or deposits and thus their primary use cannot be determined with certainty. However, Eastern and Western types are attested in these pits or deposits and thus have been used in similar contexts. The notion that Western (or mixed) types are restricted to cultic contexts exclusively, while Eastern types are more linked to domestic contexts,[74] is rather misleading.[75]

In conclusion: The great amount of variance in quantity, distribution, and style cannot be merged into a simple dichotomy. Also, the important phenomenon of regionalization cannot be captured by an East-West paradigm. *First*, the figurines from the Persian and early Hellenistic times share typological and iconographic features with their predecessors from the Iron Age. There is a stronger typological continuity than Stern's paradigm is able to capture. *Second*, the iconographic repertoire of the figurines includes Egyptian motifs, whose presence cannot be explained simply by a Phoenician *ecumene* or the East-West paradigm. *Third*, since the Greek influence on figurines is not restricted to the second half of the 4th century BCE, it has nothing or little to do with the military campaign of Alexander. Instead, it has to be considered a "cultural flow," whose starting point and endpoint are almost impossible to determine.

[73] Both aspects are in some way related because favissae usually include a rather high quantity of finds.

[74] See the table in Stern 1982: 179 and Erlich 2006: 55: "Hence, it could be that local Oriental types are to be found in private contexts, religious or other, and employed a rather conservative attitude. While mixed types are to be found in shrines and their *favissae*, where formal cult under priesthood control was more progressive and tended to absorb new forms (although the progressive attitude was probably restricted to form, not substance)."

[75] It is interesting to note that figurines are almost completely lacking at sites with a more or less predominant administrative character (e.g., Sepphoris, Samaria, Makkedah, Tell Jemmeh, and Ramat Raḥel). However, one should not put too much emphasis on the absence of evidence.

In the following, we would like to substantiate the notion that the distribution, typology, style, and iconography of Persian and early Hellenistic figurines cannot be explained by a linear hypothesis (like the West-East paradigm). Using the bearded man and the woman and child figurines as case studies, we will show that both types of figurines highlight chronological, regional, typological, and iconographic continuities or intersections in different ways. But before dealing with the material itself, one preliminary remark on the concept of Hellenization as hybridization is in order.

3. Typological and Iconographical Intersections between East and West: The Bearded Man and the Woman and Child Figurines

3.1. *Preliminary Remark: The Concept of Hellenization as Hybridization*

Let us begin with a short methodological remark. The concept of Hellenization has its hazards as has any "-ization." The term has its origin in Philo (Leg. Gai. 147), but was introduced to describe the expansion of Greek culture following the subjugation of the "East" by Alexander the Great, or more precisely in regard to the Southern Levant, the following Ptolemaic and then Seleucid dominion.[76] Hellenization comprises all areas of life (education, culture, architecture, language, attitude, fashion, religion, literature, and social organization). In earlier scholarship, Greek imports, in particular, were seen as material indicators of the acculturation of the Southern Levant, but were believed to appear only after Alexander's conquest. Nowadays, "Hellenization" is described as a "complex acculturation phenomenon,"[77] which started centuries before Alexander, insofar as Greek imports antedate the Macedonian conquest, for example.[78] The Greek world and the Southern Levant were interconnected in various exchange areas such as economics, politics, and also religion.[79] Thus, several approaches intended to avoid either the essentialism of "Hellenism" or to avoid a dichotomy between Jerusalem and Athens in thinking, living, and acting, all of which has influenced the understanding of the 3rd and 2nd century BCE so much. There was neither a truly unbroken pre-Greek tradition nor a dichotomous "clash of civilizations" in antiquity.[80] Here also the concept of hybridization has some advantages, particularly when it is employed with the (Bakhtinian) notion of an

[76] See Hengel 2003.
[77] Gerber 2006.
[78] See Nunn 2014; Ambar-Armon 2007; Martin 2007.
[79] See Bonnet 2019: 104–105.
[80] See Gerber 2006 and the remarks on persistence by Finkielsztejn 2005: 187.

unconscious, unintentional, and organic hybridity.[81] It does not seem advisable to draw sharp lines in terms of time, space, emergence, distribution, technology, etc.

Let us briefly comment on the aspect of technology. It is often emphasized that the Eastern and Western figurines differ in regard to manufacturing. While figurines of Hellenistic times, particularly the Western figurines, had a hollow body and were made in at least one, sometimes even in two molds[82] – a technique allegedly introduced from Greece – the Eastern figurines were only partly mold made and often solid. However, there are no clear-cut lines in technology as Adi Erlich has shown in her study on the Maresha figurines.[83] The techniques used for manufacturing Western and Eastern figurines overlap and are not a reliable distinct marker to separate the objects into dichotomous groups. It demonstrates the level of exchange (in different degrees of intensity) even in terms of technology rather than giving proof to a complete change of manufacturing technique.

It is not necessary to go into the discussion of Hellenization in more detail here, but we would like to highlight that we try to differentiate between influences from the Aegean world, starting with contacts and then gaining independence, and processes of Hellenization as a change of paradigm. While it is not helpful to construct dichotomies, we rather look at the flow of transition. Thus, for our more detailed case studies we chose two types of figurines whose typology and iconography reflect intersections between East and West. While the second will show continuity and altered emulation in comparison to the Iron Age, the first has no clear forerunners in the Iron Age typologies and marks change rather than continuity.

3.2. *Bearded Man Figurines (**Tab. 1**)*

Besides the horse and rider figurines, often referred to as the Persian riders[84] (**Fig. 1**), the bearded man figurines constitute the most popular and varied male type of figurine in Persian times. They are a comparatively widespread type of figurine found within the Persian period, not necessarily in regard to quantity, but in regard to transregional distribution (see map below). The characteristics of the bearded man figurines are similar but not identical to the horse and rider figurines. In the Southern Levant, the latter most often wear a Persian or Phrygian pointed cap and a cloak or cape which is sometimes open at the front.

[81] See Mackenthun 2010: 130. For a thorough study of figurines from Hellenistic Babylonia in light of miniaturization and cultural hybridity, see Langin-Hooper 2020.

[82] See Ambar-Armon 2007: 10–12; Press 2012: 179.

[83] See Erlich 2006: 47–48; 2009: 19, 26; 2014: 46–47, 54.

[84] See Stern 1982: 165–168; Nunn 2000: 42–44; Erlich 2014: 40–50; Moorey 2000; Pruß 2013: 610.



Fig. 1: Terracotta figurine of a so-called Persian Rider, Tel ʿErani (Keel and Küchler 1982: Fig. 625).

	A **Headdress**	**B** **Beard**	**C** **Clothing**	**D** **Gesture**	**E** **Symbols**
1	Phrygian cap	full beard	long robe	seated	trident
2	pointed hat	full long beard pointed/goatee	cloak/coat	standing	ears of corn[?]
3	kidaris[?]	full beard with mustache bent up	girdle, belt, or torus	right elbow bent	bow[?]/weapon/ throw-stick
4	cylindrical hat/polos (with torus or brim)	full beard with mustache bent down	"veil" falling on the back	left elbow bent	arrows[?]
5	conical hat	Dutch-style	rolled collar	hand lying on thigh/lap	whip[?], lotus[?]
6	turban/ headscarf/ kerchief	beardless	wrinkled	hand lying on chest	atef-crown, feathers
7	atef-crown/tall knobbed hat	ceremonial beard	scarf/sash	hand fondling or clasping beard	crook and flail
8	no headgear	mustache	cape	hand holding symbol or object	headband

Tab. 1: Matrix of characteristics of the bearded man figurine.

They are bearded but have neither an accentuated mustache nor a bushy full beard. Sometimes they appear to wear an (Aegean) Dutch-style full beard. Usually they do not carry any insignia or symbols.[85] However, the bearded man figurines sometimes reveal characteristic gestures and are at least in some cases accompanied by symbols. Although some of them wear a Phrygian cap, their headgear varies significantly. Hence, the bearded man figurines are one of the most varied groups of terracottas from the Persian period, thus making them the perfect test case for reevaluating typological indicators. The bearded man figurines have been discovered throughout almost all regions of Israel/Palestine, including sites from the coastal plain (Achzib,[86] Dor,[87] Ramat ha-Nadiv,[88] Apollonia-Arsuf,[89] Makmish,[90] and perhaps Jaffa[91]), the Shephelah (Tel Ẓafit[92]),

[85] See Erlich 2014: 39–50.

[86] See Karlin and Mazar 2013. Only the figurine's front was made with a mold. The figurine, which was found in a great pit in the Northern cemetery in a large pit (L04-11), is seated (the chair is broken off). The left hand is resting on the lap while the right hand is perhaps fondling the pointed full beard (=A7-B2-C2-D1-D3-D5-D7-E6). Another complete seated figurine wearing an atef-crown and clasping its beard with the right hand was published earlier, see Bisi 1990: 77, Pl. I. 2.

[87] See Stern 2010: 5–7 for the fragments of five hollow painted figurines, whose front is made in a mold (A4-B4-C2-C4-D4-D7) (cf. **Fig. 6**).

[88] Brandl 2000: 197 mentions three seated specimens from Ḥorvat ʿAqaf/Ramat ha-Nadiv. The first with an atef-crown, one "with a fez-like hat," of which only a small fragment of the lower part of the feet is preserved (see 197, Fig. 12), and a bearded man figurine with a conical tiara. Due to lacking photography we do not give the matrix here.

[89] See Roll and Tal 1999: 190–191 for the two terracotta heads of which one wears a polos-like hat and a full beard with a mustache bent down (A4-B4-C4) (see **Fig. 7**) and the other with an atef-crown (A7-B1-E6) (see **Fig. 3**).

[90] See Avigad 1960: 93, Pl. 9, 10AB for the terracotta head of a bearded male wearing an atef-crown (A7, B2, E6) and almost complete seated figurines dressed with long cloaks. The first has a pointed hat resembling an atef-crown (see the specimens from Kharayeb in Bisi 1990: Pl. IV) and a long pointed beard which he is fondling with his right (A2-B2-C1-D1-D3-D7) (see **Fig. 4**). The second wears a kidaris-like hat and is fondling his full beard with a large mustache bent down with his left hand (A3-B4-C1-D1-D4-D7) (see **Fig. 8**). Another similar figurine with a cylindrical hat is kept in the Israel Museum (IAA 1958-312) (A4-B4-C1-D1-D4-D7).

[91] See Erlich 2018: 575–577. The heavily worn figurine (Reg. No 79/A/58/0869) is perhaps fondling its beard with the left.

[92] See Bliss and Macalister 1902: 141 with Fig. 53; Culican 1969: 44, Pl. VIIA; Avissar, Uziel, and Maeir 2007. The objects in question are two well preserved figurines, of which one represents a standing rather than seated figurine with a flat conical hat with a veil falling on the back (A4-B4-C1-C4-D1-D4-D7). The other is clearly seated on a large chair, wearing an atef-crown, and fondling its full beard with the right (see **Fig. 5**). The mustache is bent up (A7-B3-C1-D1-D3-D5-D7-E6). The third figurine mentioned by Bliss and Macalister can be determined based on the museum's photo (http://www.antiquities.org.il/t/item_en.aspx?CurrentPageKey=35&rock=6; last access: 1 June 2024). It reveals a slim figurine head with highlighted eyebrows, wearing a pointed cap, and the right clasping the pointed full beard (A2-B2-D3-D7). It should be mentioned that two heads of helmeted warriors comparable to the exemplars from Dor, Makmish, and Tel Anafa of a "noble man" with Persian cap are also attributed to the Persian period finds and underline Western influence. See Avissar, Uziel, and Maeir 2007: 90.

Northern Israel (Beth-Shean[93]), and in a remarkable quantity in Idumea (Maresha,[94] Beit Nir,[95] Tel ʿErani,[96] Tel Ḥalif,[97] and Beersheba[98]). Only a few specimens do not originate from the mentioned regions, such as the examples from Petra,[99] Kharayeb,[100] Sarepta,[101] Tell Sukas,[102] or Amargetti in Cyprus.[103] More than 45 figurines have been published so far.

Although it is often stated that the figurines form two *local* groups, one of a standing man and one of a seated figure, the figurines bear distinctive categories

[93] See James 1966: 346, Fig. 116 for the two seated figurines obviously from the same type. Both wear a long robe with many wrinkles in the chest area. The left hand is fondling the top of the long beard. The figure, whose head is preserved, wears a low cylindrical hat with a veil hanging down at the back (A4-B4-C1-C4-C6-D1-D4-D7).

[94] Erlich 2006: 47: "Roughly 10–15 % (of about 100 in total) are of the standing man type, bearded and wearing a cylindrical *tiara* or a pointed cap." Most prominent is the standing figure holding a "trident" in the right hand (see below) (B1-C1-C3-C4-D2-D3-D4-E1-E3) (see **Fig. 11**), which has a close parallel (from the same mold!?) in a surface find from Beit Nir (see **Fig. 10**). Some of the figurines are fondling their full beard with the right hand or rather resting it slightly below on the chest (A3-B1-C1-C6-D2-D3-D6), others have the left arm bent and wear a girdle or belt around the wrist (C1-C3-D4-D6). Vertical folds of the garment are noticeable in several figurines. The gesture of a Hellenistic figurine, which is classified by Erlich 2019b: 376 a "boy wearing a *kausia*" is also very close to figurines of the bearded man and shows the Western influence.

[95] See Erlich 2006: 50 (A4-B1-C2-C3-C4-D2-D3-D4-E1-E3) (see **Fig. 10**). The figurine was found during the Shephelah survey by Yehuda Dagan.

[96] See Ciasca 1963: 46, Pl. XVI, XIX:1 for the standing bearded figurine with cylindrical hat with torus and veil, left arm bent, but not fondling the beard, and with the right hand resting on the thigh. A cloak bound by a thick belt or girdle around over the hips (A4-B1-B4-C1-C3-C4-D2-D3-D4-D5-D6).

[97] See Jacobs 2015: 89. At least eight specimens were found at Tel Ḥalif which form three groups. Three are clearly similar to the type described in the foregoing footnote with the figurine from Tel ʿErani. Characteristics are the strong belt, the torus around the cylindrical hat, and the left hand not fondling the pointed full beard (see **Fig. 2**). Three other fragmented heads/torsos represent a male with a thin face wearing a distinctive mustache bent down (A4-B4-C2-C3-C5). One of them wears a conical hat, the other perhaps a Persian cap, and the third a turban-like headgear (A4/A5/A6-B4-C2-C3-C5). Finally, two figurines, which are also standing, show a male wearing a Persian cap or a hooded cloak. Other discernable characteristics are a distinct bulge of the robe and the left hand holding an object which ends on the left shoulder (A1/2-B3-C2-C5-D2-D4-D8-E3/E5) (see **Fig. 14**). This object is identified by Jacobs as a bow (see discussion below).

[98] See Stern 1975: 92–93; 1982: 160, 165, Fig. 282. The figurine is of the Southern type with a cylindrical headgear with veil on the back, a prominent belt, and the left hand on the chest (A4-B1-C2-C3-C4-D2-D4-D5-D6).

[99] See Parlasca 1990: Taf. VI, 21; El-Khouri 2002: Nr. 111, Fig. 30 (= Jordan Archaeological Museum J 5924). Standing male figurine with a pointed cap or hooded cape; strikingly, both hands put on the beard's end.

[100] See Oggiano 2015a: 242, 258 (seated figurine with atef-crown).

[101] See Pritchard 1988: 47, 268, Fig. 13:60 (head of figurine with atef-crown).

[102] See Riis 1979: 40, Fig. 122–125. The two figurines only resemble the bearded man in the style of the headdress while the beard is different. The figurines seem to carry an animal with crosswise placed feet.

[103] See Ulbrich 2019: 154–155 (AN1888.1511) (bearded man with Persian cap and coat with collar).

Tab. 2: Map of the Southern Levant showing the distribution of terracotta figurines from the Persian and early Hellenistic period.

of style including headdress, beard, clothing, and gesture. They reveal a far higher degree of variability than acknowledged so far. Interestingly enough, the features vary significantly across the two main types of standing and seated figures. Nevertheless, Adi Erlich is right in assuming significant regional differences in typological and stylistic regard. The standing variant with the belted coat and the veiled polos (**Fig. 2**) is prominent at the Idumean sites south of Tel Ẓafit and Tel Ẓippor. It is attested in Maresha, Tel ʿErani, Tel Ḥalif, and Beersheba. The coastal sites, including Tel Ẓippor and Tel Ẓafit, reveal the seated variant that is fondling its beard. This latter group is further divided into the variant with atef-crown (Kharayeb,[104] Achzib, Apollonia-Arsuf, Makmish, Tel Ẓippor, and Tel Ẓafit; **Fig. 3, 4, 5**)[105], and the polos/kidaris type (Dor, Apollonia-Arsuf, Beth-Shean, Makmish, Tel Ẓippor, and Tel Ẓafit; **Fig. 6, 7, 8**). Apart from that, it is noteworthy that at least one figurine of each sub-type is documented at Apollonia-Arsuf, but the two sub-groups are accompanied by another type of male figurine (forming a *triad*?) at Ramat ha-Nadiv, Makmish, Tel Ẓafit, and Tel Ẓippor. It is difficult to decide whether this is a coincidence or not. Be that as it may, Tel Ẓafit and Tel Ẓippor mark a transition zone between Northern and Southern types.[106] The fondling gesture is sometimes performed with the right hand (Tel Ẓafit, Tel Ẓippor, Makmish; **Fig. 4, 5**), but more often with the left hand (Dor, Beth-Shean, Makmish; **Fig. 6, 7, 8**) which fingers the men's beard. Finally, it is striking that only the Southern variants bear additional symbols notwithstanding their interpretation. Although there are no clear signs of Hellenistic influence, some of the Northern variants show pleated robes or coats which may be lightly influenced by Greek terracottas or growing Greek convention (see below). We cannot go into greater detail here, but it is worth noting that the production technique reveals some Western crossover in the one-side mold-made hollow body figurines.

Do the Southern variants represent the same deity as the coastal and Northern variants? This is an intriguing question which leads us to the difficult and disputed question of identification. Many suggestions have been made and most of them are informed by the East-West paradigm on the one hand and the assumption of a Phoenician *ecumene* on the other. They oscillate between *locality* and *globality*. Ephraim Stern, who assumes that both types depict the same deity,[107]

[104] See Bisi 1990: Pl. IV.

[105] For the alleged figurine with Egyptian dress from the Yavneh depository mentioned by Stern 1982: 159 and Bisi 1990: 77, see Kletter, Ziffer, and Zwickel 2010: 9.

[106] Cf. Erlich 2006: 49.

[107] "This is indicated by the identical beard and mustache and especially by the seated attitude" (Stern 2001: 493).

Fig. 2: Terracotta figurine of a standing bearded man with a belted coat and a veiled polos, Tel Ḥalif (Jacobs 2015: Nr. 2112; by courtesy of the Lahav Archaeological Project).

Fig. 3 (left): Terracotta head with an atef-crown, Apollonia-Arsuf (by courtesy of the Apollonia-Arsuf Excavation Project; drawing by R. Pinchas). Fig. 4 (center): Terracotta figurine of a seated bearded man fondling his beard, Makmish (Avigad 1960: Pl. 10:A, by courtesy of the Israel Exploration Society). Fig. 5 (right): Terracotta figurine of a seated bearded man with an atef-crown fondling his beard, Tel Ẓafit (Culican 1969: 44, Pl. VII:A; by courtesy of the Israel Antiquities Authority).

Fig. 6 (left): Terracotta figurine (fragment) of a bearded man with a polos fondling his beard, Dor (Stern 2010: 44, Fig. 2:1; by courtesy of Tel Dor Archaeological Project). Fig. 7 (center): Terracotta head with a polos, Appolonia-Arsuf (by courtesy of the Apollonia-Arsuf Excavation Project; drawing by R. Pinchas). Fig. 8 (right): Terracotta figurine of a seated bearded man fondling his beard, Makmish (Avigad 1960: Pl. 10:B; by courtesy of the Israel Exploration Society).

Fig. 9 (left): Bronze of Osiris, el-Ǧib/Gibeon (Keel and Uehlinger 1998: Nr. 403). Fig. 10 (center): Terracotta figurine (fragment) of a standing bearded man, near Beit Nir (by courtesy of Yehuda Dagan, Israel Antiquities Authority). Fig. 11 (right): Terracotta figurine (fragment) of a standing bearded man, Maresha (by courtesy of Adi Erlich, Maresha Excavations, Israel Antiquities Authority; photo by Paul Jacobs).

rejects an association with Osiris, since beard and mustache are not distinct features of original Egyptian Osiris iconography, which is undisputedly correct (**Fig. 9**).

As an alternative, he argues in favor of Baal, a god common in both Phoenician and Palestine cult (**Fig. 12, 13**). The Phoenician [*l*]*b'lšmm* inscription on a sherd of a crater from Makmish[108] may perhaps foster this identification, as was argued already by Anson Rainey.[109]

But does the Phoenician Baal share features with the bearded man figurines? This raises the question of a distinctive Baal iconography in the Persian period, which cannot be discussed here. There is ample evidence for a pluriform worship of Baal at least by plenty of theophoric names. However, when it comes to the Persian period, any distinctive shape or features of the heavenly storm and weather god Baal remains obscure in iconographic respect. There are no canonical features of Baal terracottas for the Persian period or for the Hellenistic period. Apart from some terracotta figurines, one has to rely on the evidence of seals[110] and early coins depicting a deity sitting on a throne or on a winged wheel. Whether these represent Baal-Ḥammon, Baal-Shamem, any other local Baal or even Melqart (before his amalgamation with Heracles) is not easy (if at all possible) to assess.[111] Figurines associated with Baal-Ḥammon show him "as an aged and fatherly deity"[112] seated on a throne or a sphinx and only rarely as a standing figure. Nevertheless, it is far too simple to subsume all male figurines under one *passe-partout* and their representational function to a *koinè* triad, as was already pointed out among others by Michael Press. "Stern's view of Phoenician figurines as representing a divine triad relies on the reduction of all adult male and female figurines, with their variety of poses, gestures, and symbols, to a single pair of deities."[113] In sum, there is not very much likeness between the Phoenician Baal and the bearded man figurines.

[108] See Rainey 1989: 381; Niehr 2003: 53, 75 for the suggestion that the crater was part of a (votive) cult dedicated to Baal-Shamem in the Persian-Hellenistic sanctuary of Tel Michal. However, he remains rather reluctant in regard to the terracottas and their attribution to the same cult. For the few clues on the iconography of Baal-Shamem, see Niehr 2010.

[109] See Rainey 1989: 381. The alternative name of the site Makmish, which was noted by J. Ory 1922, is usually derived from *Dharat Maklish* (Makmish ← Maklish ← Amyklaios) and thus related to the God Apollo Amyklaios (https://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/tel-michal/; last access: 1 June 2024). An attribution of the figurines to Apollo remains shaky but may be corroborated by the specimen from the sanctuary of Amargetti in Cyprus (see below). For Apollon Amyklaios, see Simon 2007: 174.

[110] See Culican 1968.

[111] See Bonnet 2007; 1988.

[112] Niehr 2008.

[113] Press 2012: 180.

Fig. 12 (left): Basalt stele of a weather god from the 9th century BCE, Til Barsip (Schroer 2018: Nr. 1313). Fig. 13 (right): Basalt statue of a weather god (reconstruction) from the 9th century BCE, Guzana (Schroer 2018: Nr. 1318).

Fig. 14 (left): Terracotta figurine (fragment) of a bearded man with a Persian cap and a cloak with thick collar, Tel Ḥalif (Jacobs 2015: Nr. 2391; by courtesy of the Lahav Archaeological Project). Fig. 15 (right): Terracotta figurine (fragment) of a bearded man with a Persian cap and a cloak with thick collar (Ustinow Collection UT 2139791B; © Museum of Cultural History, University of Oslo, Norway).

Adi Erlich proposed a different interpretation based on a particular specimen from Maresha (and its close parallel from a surface find from Beit Nir) representing a standing bearded man (**Fig. 10, 11**). According to Erlich, these figurines present the "originals of a series, for they bear the entirety of attributes of the assumed type."[114] Although a tripartite object can be interpreted in manifold ways (for instance, as ears of corn, a bunch of arrows, a lotus flower, etc.), the object in the right hand of the Maresha type strongly resembles a trident (symbolizing a thunderbolt) as it is often represented on depictions of the so-called Syrian weather god in the Bronze and Iron Ages (**Fig. 12**).[115] The object held in the left hand is even more difficult to interpret. Considering the fact that the weather god often carries a weapon, particularly an axe or mace in his upheld hand, the elongated object could best be interpreted as a bow. However, the continuation of the lower part below the hand is not quite clear; it may also be a throw stick held upright. The interpretation as a weapon is tempting, particularly if this object is compared to the object held in the same posture by two bearded man figurines from Tel Ḥalif (**Fig. 14**). This can either be a whip or a throw stick (**Fig. 13**), which is also an attribute of the weather god on Anatolian and Syrian cylinder seals.[116] As an alternative it could be considered a bow. However, a bowstring is not visible, therefore, the bow would not be stretched. Due to the fragmentary character, it is difficult to examine the continuation of the object under the left hand. The view that it is a throw stick can be corroborated by a very similar terracotta figurine from the Ustinow collection (**Fig. 15**).[117] Although heavily worn, the continuation of the object below the man's left hand is different from the upper part, which does not fit the representation of a bow. Anyway, there is some consensus in interpreting the objects in the hand of the figure as weapons. Accordingly, it is often identified as the Edomite god Qos. But even if it is a bow, does the bearded man really represent Qos?

The problem of the iconography of Qos is in some aspects comparable to the problems we discussed above in regard to Baal. Predominantly, the attribution of images to Qos builds on two assumptions. First, the image allegedly stems from the region where the worship of Qos is assumed, and second, the iconography is not a characteristic of any other known deity. Although he supposedly "was supremely *en vogue* among the Idumeans under Persian rule,"[118] there is no genuine Qos iconography in the Persian period, and in the Hellenistic period Qos is "hellenized" and usually depicted as Zeus. "Hadad, Qos, Zeus and even

[114] Erlich 2006: 50.

[115] E.g., Arslan Tash, Sam'al, etc. See Schroer 2018: Nr. 1311, 1313, 1316, 1319, 1608, 1610, 1611, 1613, 1615, et al.

[116] See Uehlinger 1992: 343.

[117] See Skupinska-Løvset 1978: 40–41, 71, Pl. V.

[118] Knauf 1998: 677.

Dushara all more or less share the same iconographic type of weather and fertility deities."[119] If this holds true then two conclusions can be drawn. First, it is *not* possible to attribute unspecific specimens to Qos on the one hand, and it is even not possible to exclude Qos as the background of any figurines from the region. From this angle, the amazement of Erlich and Kloner that Qos is missing in the figurines of Maresha[120] becomes questionable. On the one hand, they are totally right that there is no object explicitly related to Qos, although his worship is plausible from other sources in Maresha and from a comparative perspective in Maresha, Idumea, and beyond in the Roman period.[121] On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that the bearded man was identified with Qos. The only piece of evidence that Erlich brings forward to support this identification is the bow and bunch of arrows the figurines from Maresha and the fragment of Beit Nir supposedly hold in their hands.[122] The bow as a symbol of Qos is drawn from the fact that the name means "bow" and is understood as the hypostatization of Qos.[123] But the attribution of a bow is by no means an unambiguous attribute of Qos, as can be demonstrated by the 7th century BCE Western Wall Plaza seal of Hagab[124] or a seal from Tell Jemmeh,[125] or Assyrian archers such as represented on the bulla of the governor of the city, which is mentioned by Adi Erlich.[126] Even if the trident symbol in the right hand is a thunderbolt, the identification with Qos cannot be excluded, as evinced by the 1st century CE Hadad-Qos statue in the Nabatean temple from Khirbet et-Tannur.[127] The seated Zeus-Hadad limestone statue (1.15 m high and 0.57 m wide) holding a thunderbolt in his right hand (**Fig. 16**) is wearing a chiton with a himation draped over his shoulder, both reflecting Greek influence. While the attribute of the thunderbolt is usually taken as a sign for the Syrian storm god Hadad, the only inscription from the site is the Nabatean inscription reading, "(The stele) which Qosmalak made for Qos, the god of *hwrw*."[128] The toponym *Ḥūrawā* may represent the ancient name of the

[119] Wenning 2009: 581.

[120] See Erlich and Kloner 2008: 126.

[121] See Teixidor 1977: 89–91. For an overview of the epigraphic evidence and on Gerasa in the Imperial Age, see Lichtenberger 2003: 230.

[122] See Erlich 2006: 50–52.

[123] See Knauf 1998: 676.

[124] See Keel 2017: 430–431, Nr. 340.

[125] See Keel 2013: 7, Nr. 12.

[126] See Avigad and Sass 1997: Nr. 402A–B. For this type, see also Keel 2017: 452–453, Nr. 385. Cf. Schroer 2018: Nr. 1940–1941.

[127] See McKenzie 2013: 72, 74, 77; McKenzie et al. 2002: 74, 76 with Fig. 23a. For the male figurine depicted on the frieze with a thunderbolt behind his left shoulder, see Wenning 2009: 580. The iconography is again a hybrid mixture between Syrian Hadad and Greek Zeus.

[128] Teixidor 1977: 89. See also Whiting and Wellman 2016: 27–28.

Fig. 16: Relief of a male deity from around the 1st century CE, Khirbet et-Tannur (Cincinnati Art Museum 1939.224).

site. Thus, it can be concluded that "Qōs was very prominent at Tannūr."[129] If so, one may draw a line between the cult statue and the symbol of the thunderbolt to Qos. However, whether this makes the figurines in Maresha and Beit Nir also a Hellenized Qos remains uncertain and is still open for discussion.

Let us finally discuss another feature of the bearded man figurines, particularly of the group of figurines in the coastal strip and Beth-Shean. A striking detail of some of these figurines is the atef-crown.[130] The Egyptian *3tf*-crown on figurine heads is a common feature known from Iron Age figurines from Transjordan, e.g. the mold-made head from Tell Jawa or the terracotta head from Bethsaida (et-Tell) (**Fig. 17**).[131] While it is often related to royal power and thus rendered as an attribute of El, the atef-crown has its origin clearly in Egypt where it is at firsthand a symbol of Osiris. Outside of Egypt, the headgear combining the crown of Upper Egypt with two ostrich feathers is not clearly a feature identifying a figurine as Osiris, particularly in the Late Bronze or Iron Ages, but this is more securely attested in the Persian period.[132] Not having a ceremonial beard, but rather a beard and a mustache, the small terracotta heads differ from the Egyptian(izing) Osiris statues. The Ammonite specimens from the Iron Age

[129] Healey 2001: 61.

[130] See Bisi 1990: 77–79. Bisi suggests a development from the atef-crown to the kidaris, but this may be too straightforward in bringing the different types into connection.

[131] See Daviau 2002: 66, Fig. 2:33; Daviau 2014: 6; Schroer 2018: Nr. 1779 (cf. Nr. 1511). For the "Ammonite" statuary, see Burnett 2016; Daviau and Dion 1994.

[132] See Daviau and Dion 1994: 160–161.

Fig. 17: Terracotta head with an atef-crown, Bethsaida (Schroer 2018: Nr. 1779).

probably depict the El-like god of the Ammonites Milkom,[133] but does this have consequences for the identification of the crowned bearded man figurines wearing an atef-crown from Achzib, Apollonia-Arsuf, Beth-Shean, Tel Ẓippor, Tel Ẓafit, and Makmish? Is the crown an insignia of a royal figure? Does it hint at a royal El-like deity or does it bring this group of bearded man figurines close to Osiris? Michèle Daviau emphasizes the parallelism of the Iron Age figurines with those of the Persian period and points particularly at the specimens from Kharayeb stating, "Examples of this style of male figurine were present in both the Iron Age, as an Osiris figure, and in the Persian period, as a seated male with a long beard, respectively."[134] While Ephraim Stern rejected any resemblance to Osiris due to the mustache, from our point of view the affinity of the figurine to Osiris has certain validity.[135]

There is ample evidence for Osiris and his cult in the Southern Levant, particularly in the Persian, Hellenistic, and early Roman periods. Originally stemming from the Delta region, Osiris became the local deity in Upper Egypt. The myth narrates that he was killed by his brother Seth and avenged by his son Horus, who was born by his sister-wife Isis. The myth is related to death and resurrection and thus Osiris is mostly connected to his existence as mummy and as the ruler of the afterlife. His divine duty is to preside over the judgement of the dead. Associated with life, vitality, fertility, and abundance, he is prominently identified with the deceased king, but also with commoners (every deceased person can be referred to as "Osiris-X.X.").[136] Osiris is mostly depicted in the form of a standing mummy, but there are also sitting statues from Egypt.

[133] See Daviau and Dion 1994: 164; Tyson 2019: 5–6.
[134] Daviau 2002: 66.
[135] See Nunn 2000: 81.
[136] See von Lieven 2006.

In general, Osiris is easily recognizable due to the atef-crown and the ceremonial beard as well as two further attributes, such as the crooked staff and a scourge (crook and flail) held upright in his arms which are folded right over left in front of his upper abdomen. The great popularity of Osiris in the Persian period is attested in the very common Osiris ex-voto statues, e.g. in the sanctuary of ʿAin Manawir, which revealed 370 bronze (votive) statuettes of Osiris from the 5th/4th century BCE with an average height of 7–11 cm.[137] Apparently, the cult of Osiris was disseminated along trade routes from Egypt.[138] An inscription from the 2nd century BCE attests the dedication of a figurine to Osiris as votive from Umm el-ʿAmad.[139]

Osiris' popularity in Israel/Palestine during the Persian period is evidenced by various objects and object classes – statuettes, amulets, seals, etc. We cannot give a full record here in regard to Isis (who is often accompanied by Osiris) and the Horus child, the offspring of this prominent couple, but let us mention some of the proper Osiris finds and start with the sanctuary of Miẓpe Yammim, located in the Meiron massif northwest of the Sea of Galilee. The excavations revealed a statue of green schist (13.5 cm high)[140] which depicts a Hathor-like Isis, the son Horus, and the god Osiris, in the center. It was found near the altar alongside four precious bronze objects – a bronze situla, an Apis bull, a prancing lion cub, and a recumbent ram.[141] The two-room sanctuary was built in the Persian period and continued as an open sanctuary in the Hellenistic period to which the stone votive statue supposedly belongs.[142] The sanctuary was probably desecrated in the Hasmonean period. There are clear indications that the worshippers of this sanctuary, perhaps Sidonians, came from the Phoenician coast, since the bronze situla with Egyptian motifs (which had probably been manufactured in Egypt) bore a votive inscription (added secondarily) to Astarte by a certain *ʾAkbor Bod ʾEšmun*. During the excavation, an additional bronze Osiris statuette (10.2 cm high) with crook and flail was found; it was dated to the 26th Dynasty (664–525 BCE) by Andrea M. Berlin and Rafael Frankel based on Egyptian parallels.[143] Due to the stratigraphy, the Osiris statue can be attributed clearly to the Persian period.[144] According to Berlin and Frankel, the statue "is essentially identical to one found at Gibeon (Pritchard 1964: Fig. 50.1), very close to one found in the High Place at Dan (Biran 1994: Fig. 39), and is similar to one of the seven Osiris

[137] See Wuttmann, Coulon, and Gombert 2007: 167–173.

[138] See Sulimani 2015. For the 'Byblos connection,' see Griffiths 1980: 28–34 and for the Roman period, see Quack 2017.

[139] See Nunn 2000: 20.

[140] See Frankel and Ventura 1998; Berlin and Frankel 2012: 43–44.

[141] See Frankel and Ventura 1998; Berlin and Frankel 2012.

[142] See Kamlah 1999: 169.

[143] See Berlin and Frankel 2012: 43, Fig. 28.

[144] See Kamlah 1999: 169.

figurines found in a cache of bronze figurines at Ashkelon (Iliffe 1935: Pl. 30:1)."[145] To the mentioned statues from Dan and Gibeon we may add the bronze statue from Tell Deir ʿAlla (7.5 cm high), which also has the small loop on the lower left hand side and which is stylistically close.[146] Ashkelon has evinced in sum eight Osiris bronzes; seven in the well-known 1936 hoard[147] and one found in a winery (Room 402) in the excavations of Lawrence Stager.[148] Dan has brought two of them to light and both are related as votives to the sanctuary.[149] The popularity of Osiris is further corroborated by some Osiris amulets[150] and seals,[151] some of them attesting personal names mentioning Osiris (and we may add the personal name יצהר in the genealogy of Kehat Exod 6:18). One of the Ashkelon figurines bears a votive inscription that Osiris shall give life.[152]

Evidently, the cult of Osiris was (perhaps even well) known alongside the Phoenician coast and the sanctuaries alongside the main trade routes to the north.[153] Taking the popularity of Osiris as point of departure, it may indeed be possible that even some of the terracotta figurines are *local variants* of Osiris. This includes not only the atef-crowned variant but perhaps also the Southern "Qos"-related specimens.

Bringing Osiris into play is all the more tempting if we take into account that Qos was later on identified with Apollo and Apollo in turn with Osiris[154] (note that also the consort of Qos was identified with Isis or Atargatis/Aphrodite in the Romanized world[155]). Although these later transformations may not be easily transposed onto the Hellenistic era, they may indicate the transforming potential in processes of hybridization of the traditional gods. The variant of the bearded man figurine uncovered in an Apollo sanctuary at Amargetti in Cyprus may corroborate the suggestion of more or less fluid identities in the late Persian and early Hellenistic period. If the archer Apollo has something to do with the enthroned deity as the highest god El-Elyon-Baal-Shamem-Zeus,[156] then the

145 Berlin and Frankel 2012: 43.

146 See van der Kooij and Ibrahim 1989: 108.

147 See Iliffe 1935.

148 See Stager, Master, and Schloen 2008: 281 with Fig. 1557.

149 See Biran 1994: 216.

150 See Herrmann 2016: 85 with Pl. XXI.

151 See, e.g., Aschkelon Nr. 61, Tell el-ʿAğul Nr. 338, Akko Nr. 64, Achzib Nr. 154, Tell el-Farʿa-Süd Nr. 756, Tell el-Hesi Nr. 4, Gezer Nr. 674 in Keel 2010a; 2010b; 2013.

152 See Iliffe 1935: 66–67 and Pl. 33:2. For parallels, see Nunn 2000.

153 On Isa 10:4 and its possible connection to Osiris, see Lippke 2013.

154 See Teixidor 1977: 89–90; Healey 2001: 123.

155 See Healey 2001: 107, 127, 182.

156 See the argument of Rośoł 2007, who derives Apollo from an epithet **'ab 'eliōn* related to Baal-Shamim. However, this derivation remains disputed (see Graf and Ley 2006). For the reception of the seated Apollo on Seleucid coins, see Erickson and Wright 2011. In terms of cultic and symbolic continuity, we can add here the fine carnelian gemstone from the 1st century CE from

argument seems to come full circle. Thus, it is neither wrong to relate the bearded man to Baal-Shamem nor to Qos or Osiris; at the end it will be impossible to discern because the divine identities transform, crossfade, and dissolve into "types." It is particularly this argument which reinforces our reluctance to separate East and West too easily. Furthermore, it should be noted that within the process of "Hellenization" (and already earlier), those kinds of identification processes were a common practice "for the sake of ritual efficacy" and for the integration of the "local" into the "global," that is, to "incorporate them into international networks."[157] Figurines will often *not* represent a "name" (such as only Baal, Osiris, Apollo, or Qos), but rather a "figure" or "type." If no epigraphic clues are available or a clear context of use can be determined, a clear identification and assignment will only be possible from an emic perspective. Taking now into account that (a) the woman and child figurines do not differ significantly between the Phoenician coast and Idumea (see below) and (b) accepting the proposal below that the woman and child figurines may have something to do with the growing prominence of Isis and (c) considering the growing prominence of Harpocrates as child, which has been demonstrated by Thomas Staubli,[158] the obvious identification of the bearded man figurines with Qos becomes more fluid and open to an identification as a local variant of Osiris. Perhaps it is even possible that the symbols of the prominent standing bearded man figurines in Tel Ḥalif, Maresha, and Beit Nir are not a bow and arrows but local forms reminiscent of the crook and flail. It is then perhaps acceptable that the figurines may have also been seen as local representations of Osiris or have even been identified with representations of the popular Egyptian god. A decision either for bow and arrow, thunderbolt, and throw stick, or for crook and flail remains impossible. The crux of hybridizations is that they dissolve rigid form patterns so that identifications are more open.

In sum: (a) It became evident that the rather simplistic East or Oriental categorization does not do justice to the complexity of the various influences and hybrid forms of the bearded man figurines and their attributes. (b) The variety of bearded men types is, moreover, greater than their identification as either "Baal" or "Qos" would do justice to. The types connect several regions and are neither restricted to the coast nor to Idumea. (c) While some of the figurines reveal a continuation of the iconography of the weather god, the bearded man figurines with atef-crown are, at the very least, open for an interpretation as Osiris. Thus, they may provide yet more evidence for the prominence of Osiris (and Isis) in the Southern Levant from the 5th century BCE onwards.

Ramat ha-Nadiv (for the bearded man figurines from this site, see above) which depicts oddly enough an Apollo-like figurine with a trident (see Hirschfeld and Peleg 2005).

[157] Bonnet 2019: 105, 106.

[158] See his contribution to the present volume.

These particular aspects can also be shown in discussing the woman and child terracottas, which will be dealt with now.

3.3. *Woman and Child Figurines (**Tab. 3**)*[159]

In contrast to the bearded man figurines, the woman and child figurines do not emerge in Persian times, but can be linked to longstanding traditions in the ancient Near East and the Southern Levant in particular.[160] This type of figurine goes back to the Late Bronze and Iron Age I, and continued throughout the Iron Age II until Persian and early Hellenistic times. In their most basic form, these figurines show a female adult carrying, holding, or nursing a child[161] and, thus, might be considered *kourotrophic* iconography.[162] However, the typological and stylistic variety of these figurines is much more complex than this denomination and minimalistic description suggests. Based on the material from Persian and early Hellenistic times, the figurines differ in regard to the posture of the woman, her clothing, the age of the child, its position, and, as a consequence of the latter, its arm gesture.

Taking these varieties into consideration, the woman and child figurines can be divided into four sub-types: 1. a standing woman holding a child at her left hip, 2. a seated or standing woman nursing a child, 3. a seated woman with a child on her lap, 4. a standing woman with a child seated on her left shoulder.

The *first sub-type*, a woman holding a child at her left hip, is known from Tel Ḥalif (**Fig. 18**), Tel Ẓippor (**Fig. 19**),[163] Beersheba, and the Ashkelon region (**Fig. 20**).[164] The molded figurines show a standing woman in frontal pose with

[159] Parts of the following case study have been published in Pyschny 2021.

[160] For a thorough study on images of woman and child from the Bronze Age, see Budin 2011.

[161] In contrast to Nakhai 2014, who divides the woman and child figurines into three classes (women pregnant or in the process of child birth, women holding children, and women nursing children), we do not count figurines showing pregnant women into this type of figurines. However, as will be shown below, the so-called dea gravida figurines play a crucial role for understanding the typology and iconography of the woman and child figurines.

[162] As was pointed out by Budin 2011: 29, to use this term "is both an anachronism and an imposition. The word itself comes from the Greek *kouros*, meaning 'child' or 'boy,' and *trophos*, 'feader, rearer, nurse.'" As the title of a function, *kourotrophos* is the name or epiclesis of several Greek gods and goddesses concerned with helping children safely achieve adulthood (e.g., Artemis, Hekate, Gaia, Demeter, Aphrodite). However, Budin (2011: 30) has good reasons to use this term for images of woman and child in the Bronze Age: "To use the term 'kourotrophos,' then, designates exactly what the images portray: an adult (mortal or divine) who nourishes and/or protects a child, regardless of whether or not that adult is to be understood as the child's parent. In this way, the terminology allows for issues of wet nurses, adoption, and caretakers without automatically implying the concept of 'mother.'" This kind of descriptive usage of terms is to be distinguished from referring to *kourotrophos* as a more or less specific iconographic motif in the Greek world.

[163] See Negbi 1966: Pl. 1:2.

[164] See Stern 1982: 169, Fig. 286:8.

	A **posture of the woman**	**B** **clothing of the woman**	**C** **age of the child**	**D** **position of the child**	**E** **arm/hand gesture of the child**
1	seated	Egypto-Phoenician wig	baby or infant	on the lap (being nursed)	left hand on the woman's left breast
2	standing	headdress	small child	on the belly (being nursed/held)	right arm put around the woman's shoulder
3	left arm put around the child	hairband	child old enough to sit stable at the shoulder	on the left side (being held in a seated or lying position)	right hand rests on the woman's right shoulder
4	left arm holds the child and rests on its shoulder	necklace pendant		on the left shoulder (seated)	left hand on left knee
5	left hand on child's ankle	(veil-like) himation			right hand on the woman's head
6	left hand on her left breast	robe			hands/arms not visible at all
7	right hand touching her right breast	upper body is nude			
8	right hand rests on her belly	nude			
9	right hand rests on the child				
10	right hand resting on her waist				
11	both hands resting on her waist				

Tab. 3: Matrix of characteristics of the woman and child figurines.

her hair down. In some cases, she wears some kind of headdress (see **Fig. 19**) or hairband (see **Fig. 18**). Details like eyes, nose, and sometimes even the mouth are clearly visible. The woman is portrayed either nude (see **Fig. 18**[165]) or semi-nude (see **Fig. 19** and **20**) with clothing from the waist down while the breasts remain exposed. She holds the child by putting her left arm around him or her. The right arm either supports the child's ankles or rests at the woman's waist.

[165] On one specimen from Tel Ḥalif, the nude woman wears a pendant necklace (see Jacobs 2015: 61).

The children linked to the female figures are of different ages (Tel Ẓippor and Beersheba: baby or infant; Tel Ḥalif: small child) and it is almost impossible to discern their gender. In the cases of babies or infants, genitalia are not visible at all, and even when small children are depicted nude, the focus of the composition is not on the child's genitalia. The only examples that show more or less visible (male) genitalia are known so far from Tel Ḥalif. However, on most specimens the child faces the front and his or her body is draped around the woman's left side in a sitting/lying or, less frequently, a more standing position (see **Fig. 18**). Very often the child touches the woman's left breast with his or her left hand while his or her right arm is put around the woman's neck and his or her hand rests on her shoulder.

Figurines showing a woman with child on her left hip or side are also known from Dor and Maresha, but these specimens differ from the described iconographic composition. The figurines from Dor depict a woman wearing a different (head-)dress and a baby or infant completely wrapped up in this clothing with only its face visible (**Fig. 21**). The specimens are completely solid and modeled on the front. Even though Stern lists these figurines in his Eastern group, he admits that they "show Greek influence in their dress and hair style"[166] and interprets the (head-)dress as a himation.[167] In Hellenistic art, the himation is usually wrapped around a woman's body. "Even though there are variations on how the himation falls or is wrapped around the arms …, the bulk of the fabric is shown either covering her completely or wrapped around her waist. … Furthermore, in statues of women, sometimes the himation is pulled over the head, like a veil … ."[168]

Even though the figurines of Dor do not show any wrinkles in the garment, a certain Greek influence is evident. This impression is supported by the somehow similar figurines from Maresha[169] with the same veil-like himation. Thus, already this sub-type attests to a certain fluidity or hybridity within the East-West paradigm. This impression is supported by two figurines from Hilalia,[170] which show similarities to both the abovementioned figurine from Tel Ẓippor and the

[166] Stern 2010: 14.

[167] See Stern 2010: 12.

[168] Bobou 2015: 50.

[169] On the Maresha figurines, the himation corresponds more to Hellenistic conventions. Furthermore, the child is not an infant but rather a small child. Also, the position of the child is not completely similar with the child being closer to the woman's head than in the figurines from Dor. See Erlich and Kloner 2008.

[170] See Nunn 2000: 49 and Pl. 19,39.



Fig. 18 (left): Terracotta figurine of a woman holding a child at her left hip, Tel Ḥalif (Cornelius 2014: Fig. 3; by courtesy of the Lahav Archaeological Project). Fig. 19 (center): Terracotta figurine of a woman holding a child at her left hip, Tel Ẓippor (Negbi 1966: pl. 1:2; by courtesy of the Israel Antiquities Authority). Fig. 20 (right): Terracotta figurine of a woman holding a child at her left hip, Ashkelon region (by courtesy of the Israel Antiquities Authority).



Fig. 21 (left): Terracotta figurine of a woman with child completely wrapped up in her dress, Dor (Stern 2010: 63, Fig. 13:4; by courtesy of Tel Dor Archaeological Project). Fig. 22 (right): Terracotta figurine of a woman with child completely wrapped up in her dress, Dor (Stern 2010: 63, Fig. 13:5; by courtesy of Tel Dor Archaeological Project).

rather Greek style figurines from Dor (**Fig. 22**). While the posture and gesture of the child are in line with the example from Tel Ẓippor, the veil-like dress, which falls from her head, nestles around the pointed headgear of the child, and runs under her right arm, resembles somehow the figurines from Dor.[171] As Astrid Nunn points out, "Haltung und Art, nicht aber die Details, wie Gesichtszüge oder Faltenwurf, ähneln ionischen Terrakotten des beginnenden 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr."[172]

The *second sub-type* of woman and child figurines shows a seated or standing woman nursing a child. A complete example of this type was found in Dor (**Fig. 23**) and several parallels are known from other sites in Israel/Palestine like, for instance, Makmish (**Fig. 24**). The figurines are hollow with a front made in a mold. Most of these figurines depict a (nude) woman standing on a pedestal nursing a child with her left breast. The woman's right hand rests either on her belly or is put softly on the infant. The woman wears a long Egypto-Phoenician wig falling to the shoulders in the front. Because of the distribution of these figurines, which is restricted to Palestine, Cyprus, and Phoenicia, and of the wig, which he considers Phoenician rather than Egyptian, Stern assumes that the figurines have been produced by Phoenician craftsmen.[173] The similarities of this figurine to the so-called dea gravida figurines are striking not only in regard to the headdress but even more so in regard to the technique of manufacture and style (**Fig. 25**). The dea gravida figurines that emerged in the late Iron Age II and became very popular throughout the Persian period show a goddess seated, pregnant, and wearing a long robe and headdress. Based on the finest examples from Achzib (see **Fig. 25**), the figurines can be described as follows: "The figure sits on a narrow, high-backed chair, her body inclined slightly forward and her face downcast. She draws her right hand above her prominent abdomen and rests the left hand along her knee. She wears a long dress, without folds, and a veil over her head. This covers two projections on the side of the head, most probably the side-coils of hair …, thus giving her a distinctive hooded appearance …"[174] These figurines are typically, but not necessarily accurately, identified as a goddess and have been found at Phoenician sites in the Levant like Achzib, Makmish, Dor, Tel Ẓippor, Tell es-Saʿidiyeh, Tell Abu Ḥawam, Kharayeb, Byblos, Tyre, and many more including Cyprus. The figurines are hollow, mold made, and were often found in favissae buried with other objects. Interestingly enough, this "blending" of woman and child and dea gravida figurines or, in other words, a *kourotrophic* dea gravida is also present in the Cypriote figurine assemblage,

[171] Nunn 2000: 49 herself mentions the stylistic parallels to one of the figurines from Dor (see Stern 2000: 167).

[172] Nunn 2000: 49.

[173] See Stern 2010: 13.

[174] Culican 1969: 35, 37.

such as from Kition for instance.[175] Thus, it could be even a mix with the later *kourotrophos* type.[176] While the figure on the bent arm is usually an infant, two figurines from Kition-Bamboula (BM 1880,0710.31–32) offer a striking variant where the child looks rather old and is wearing a beard and a Persian cap comparable to the Persian riders (**Fig. 26**).[177] This particularity has a striking parallel in a dea gravida *kourotropha* from the Ustinow Collection in Oslo (Nr. 39802.1) which is said to have its origin in Palestine (**Fig. 27**).[178]

The typological similarities between the dea gravida and woman and child figurines might have significant consequences for the understanding of the latter, since it makes an interpretation of the woman as goddess more likely and at least opens up the possibility to link these figurines with the Isis and Horus motif. Interestingly enough, this line of interpretation was carefully proposed for the figurines from Achzib,[179] but not seriously considered for the overall material in Persian period Israel/Palestine.

Among others, this is due to the fact that the woman and child figurines do not attest to the well-known Egyptian Isis and Horus iconography showing Isis in a hieratic pose seated on a throne and holding Horus the child in her lap (**Fig. 28**). The goddess is portrayed reaching with her right hand to her left breast in order to nurse the child whose head she supports with the other hand. This imagery symbolizing the importance of nourishment as a source of life is present in Egyptian iconography from the Old Kingdom onwards and is closely related to the theology of royal power.[180]

Even though the genesis of Isis is a story that largely remains to be written, it is safe to say that Isis becomes very much a goddess of the family starting from the first quarter of the 1st millennium BCE. Her functions are predominantly defined as those of a wife (to Osiris) and a mother (to Horus). "As a result of this Isis was venerated everywhere in Egypt around 500 BCE; for the Mediterranean

[175] See Maillard 2019, Vol. I: 85, 89 with Vol. II: Nr. 6–13, Pl. 3–5; Karageorghis 1999: Pl. LXX, Nr. 25; Yon and Caubet 2010: 64, Fig. 32.

[176] For the transition, see the figurine from the Cesnola Collection (Karageorghis 1999: Nr. 212), where the child is wearing a conical cap and the posture of the women resembles the dea gravida type. Also, see Karageorghis 1999: 255–256, Nr. 26–32, esp. Nr. 26 on Pl. LXVI:3. The example from Dor contests the assumption that the dea gravida type with a child is "une invention des artisans coroplastes kitiens qui semblent ainsi avoir découplé les attributs liés à la fécondité" (Maillard 2019, Vol. I: 86). For ties between Cyprus and the Southern Levant in terms of figurines, see most recently Erlich 2019b.

[177] See Fourrier and Kiely 2012: 289.

[178] See Skupinska-Løvset 2014: 77, Fig. 4; 1978: 22–24, 66, PI. II.

[179] See Stern 2010: 14: "Similar figurines … should probably be regarded as Canaanite versions of Isis and Horus".

[180] See Bricault and Versluys 2014.



Fig. 23 (left): Terracotta figurine of a woman nursing a child, Dor (Stern 2010: 63, Fig. 13:1; by courtesy of Tel Dor Archaeological Project). Fig. 24 (center): Terracotta figurine of a woman nursing a child, Makmish (Avigad 1960: Pl. 11:C; by courtesy of the Israel Exploration Society). Fig. 25 (right): Terracotta figurine of a dea gravida, Achzib (Winter 1983: Fig. 381).

Fig. 26 (left): Terracotta figurine of a dea gravida holding a child with a Persian cap, Kition-Bamboula (BM 1880,0710.32; © The Trustees of the British Museum). Fig. 27 (right): Terracotta figurine of a dea gravida holding a child with a Persian cap, Palestine (UT 39802.1; © Museum of Cultural History, University of Oslo, Norway; photo by Lill-Ann Chepstow-Lusty).

she represented the quintessential Egyptian goddess."[181] Starting in the Iron Age IIC,[182] the motif of *Isis lactans* becomes very popular in Persian and (early) Hellenistic Israel/Palestine. "Clearly the most commonly represented deity was *Isis* … She is the goddess *par excellence* on the scarabs."[183] Considering that the pluriform imagery (e.g., showing Isis in a standing or seated posture) in Persian period Israel/Palestine reflects a somehow canonized, but at the same time strongly symbolic understanding of Egyptian culture and iconography, the woman and child figurines might be considered a local variant of the Isis and Horus motif or are at least open for this interpretation.

The possible link to the iconography of Isis and Horus is even stronger in the *third sub-type*, a seated woman with a child on her lap. This sub-type obviously adheres to the canonized Isis and Horus iconography but is only attested at two sites in Israel/Palestine, Maresha (**Fig. 29**) and Tel Ḥalif.[184] The figurine from Tel Ḥalif is in a rather fragmentary state providing us with the middle part of the figurines only. Luckily, the evidence from Maresha provides us with a basically intact figurine. It is safe to say, that the figurines show a seated woman (probably on a throne) holding an infant on her lap and nursing it with her left breast. This motif may likely represent the Egyptian goddess Isis and her son Horus[185] as was also pointed out by Stephanie M. Langin-Hooper in regard to some figurines from Hellenistic Babylonia. "The particular motif of the enthroned mother has strong parallels in representations of the goddess Isis suckling the god Horus (also known as Harpocrates in the Hellenistic period) – imagery that was widely popular throughout the Mediterranean in the Hellenistic period …"[186] In fact, similar iconography was quite popular on Hellenistic figurines from Kharayeb and is also interpreted as Isis and Horus iconography. "Isis lactans is associated with at least five rather similar figurines … . The goddess, enthroned with naked Harpocrates seated on her left thigh, has corkscrew curls and wears a long *chiton* and a fringed *himation* with the Isiac knot between her breasts."[187] As an alternative, this sub-type could be considered a representation of Aphrodite and Eros, as was shown by Adi Erlich with reference to the specimens from Maresha.[188]

[181] Bricault and Versluys 2014: 31.

[182] See, for instance, a figurine from Lachish showing a *standing* woman in an Egyptian dress nursing a child in Keel and Uehlinger 1998: 334, Nr. 328. This figurine and two terracotta molds from Samaria showing an enthroned goddess with a child on her lap (Keel and Uehlinger 1998: 334, Nr. 327a–b) are explicitly considered "a local adaptation of the Isis-Horus motif" (333).

[183] Keel and Uehlinger 1998: 378.

[184] See Jacobs 2015: 61. For a close late Hellenistic parallel from Dor, see Erlich 2010: Fig. 11.

[185] See Jacobs 2015: 61.

[186] Langin-Hooper 2020: 109.

[187] Castiglione 2019: 362.

[188] See Erlich and Kloner 2008: 18–20.

Fig. 28 (left): Bronze of Isis nursing Horus, Egypt (Keel and Schroer 2004: 235). Fig. 29 (right): Terracotta figurine of a seated woman with a child on her lap, Maresha (by courtesy of Adi Erlich, Maresha Excavations, Israel Antiquities Authority; photo by Clara Amit).

The *fourth sub-type*, a standing woman with a child seated on the left shoulder, is most prominently attested in Maresha (**Fig. 30**)[189] (around 22 figurines) but has parallels in Tel Ẓafit,[190] Beersheba, Tel Ẓippor,[191] Tel ʿErani,[192] Tel Ḥalif,[193] and possibly Lachish.[194] Erlich notes that this specific type is restricted to Idumea.

Based on the well-preserved material from Maresha, this type can be described as follows: The figurines are made either with one mold (mold-made front, while the back is not modeled but roughly smoothed and scratched instead) or with two molds.[195] In both cases, only a few details have been cast in the mold. Some figurines show traces of red and black paint. "The child is made of thin wall for the front, and thick wall for the back, which is sometimes made of two

[189] Erlich 2006: 52 (Pl. III, 7–8).

[190] See Bliss and Macalister 1902: Pl. 70 (for a drawing) and Stern 1982: 169, Fig. 289, Nr. 7 (for a photo).

[191] See Negbi 1966: 10, Pl. 1.

[192] See Ciasca 1963: 50–52, Pl. XV:1, 3.

[193] Jacobs 2015: 60 lists fourteen figurines of this type.

[194] For the post-exilic figurines from Lachish, see Tufnell 1953: Pl. 33. However, due to the rather poor state of preservation it is difficult to decide whether Tufnell 1953: Pl. 33, Fig. 15 represents a woman and child figurine.

[195] See Erlich 2014: 51.

thick coils of clay joined in the middle of the back."[196] The figurines can be up to 12.5 cm high[197] and up to 4.5 cm wide. The woman is in a frontal pose. She is portrayed with her hair down, some kind of band on her forehead, and large eyes. She appears to be semi-nude[198] with her breasts exposed. The position of her hands varies. She either rests both hands on her waist underneath the navel or holds the child's ankles with her left, while the right rests along her body. The child, whose gender cannot be discerned with certainty,[199] has grown to a size that allows him or her to be stable on the female's shoulder. Sometimes he or she has unusually long legs, which hang over the left shoulder of the woman. According to Adi Erlich, this type is based on a Greek-Ionian type, which is much more plastic and three-dimensional. As noted by her, this sub-type is influenced by the *kourotrophos* and is probably of Greek-Ionian origin, even though its style is without doubt local. "Although the source of the type is Ionian, the result is Eastern and basically local."[200] Thus, this sub-type clearly attests to a mixing of Western motifs and Eastern style, a phenomenon that is best described as hybridization.

In terms of interpretation, we face a somewhat similar debate as in the case of the bearded man figurines. Once again, the million-dollar question is, do the woman and child figurines portray a goddess or a mortal woman? In the case of the woman and child figurines, this question is almost impossible to resolve since the figurines predominantly lack clear divine attributes. Stern seems to be well aware of this dilemma when he proposes an interpretation as fertility goddess[201] but states immediately afterwards: "It is also possible, on the other hand, that these figurines should be interpreted as votive objects dedicated by women when making supplications to the gods."[202] Stern's interpretation as a fertility goddess is based on two rather problematic aspects: first, the postulate that the majority of woman and child figurines depict nude females with emphasized and exaggerated sexual organs and, second, the straight linkage and exclusive restriction of nudity to aspects of fertility.[203] While her identification as a goddess cannot be supported by either of these arguments, it is supported by the typological and stylistic similarities between the dea gravida and woman and child

[196] Ibid.

[197] See the table provided by Erlich 2014.

[198] It is difficult and sometimes even impossible to assess the degree of nudity due to the state of preservation. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the paint should insinuate a form of clothing.

[199] Jacobs 2015 considers the child a boy.

[200] Erlich 2006: 52.

[201] It is interesting to note that Negbi 1966: 4 proposed an interpretation as Demeter and Kore for at least one of the woman and child figurines from Tel Ẓippor.

[202] Stern 2010: 13.

[203] For the various understandings of nudity in Southern Levantine iconography, see Pyschny 2019.

Fig. 30: Terracotta figurines of a standing woman with a child seated on her shoulder, Maresha (by courtesy of Adi Erlich, Maresha Excavations, Israel Antiquities Authority; photo by Clara Amit).

figurines. If the dea gravida can be considered a goddess (without showing any clear divine attributes!), there is no reason to exclude this line of interpretation in the case of the woman and child figurines. But let us take a closer look at the iconography of these figurines in order to gain some insights for the question of interpretation.

Although it is extremely popular, even in recent studies, to link the woman and child figurines with aspects of motherhood, we find this term rather misleading.[204] It is by no means (self-)evident that the woman represented is the child's (biological) mother. Thus, the relationship portrayed here is not one of actual maternity but rather of nourishing and caretaking. The (mortal or divine) woman can be understood as a biological mother, wet nurse, adoptive mother, or another kind of caretaker. In fact, the actual identity or social role of the woman is not decisive for the meaning(s) of the figurine. It is important to note that the figurine is not a simple portrayal of a (concrete) everyday scene but has a rather symbolic meaning. Typical scenes from everyday life like nursing, holding, or caring for a child are used to present the relationship between and the relatedness of woman and child. The figurines present (literary embodied) connections.[205] Parallel to the depictions of children on Neo-Assyrian reliefs,

[204] Langin-Hooper 2020 distinguishes between biological and social mother.
[205] Budin 2011: 329.

taking care of children is almost exclusively linked to women. They do not only nourish the babies or infants but also take care of older girls and boys.[206] Even though "women were probably the primary caregivers of infants in the ancient world, they were most certainly not exclusively so, nor did they have to be. … Fathers, grandparents, older siblings, and members of the more extended family can, did, and still do contribute to the rearing of small children. Nevertheless, they are not shown acting in these capacities. The exclusive female sex of kourotrophos is at least partially ideological, but that ideology is wholly consistent. 100% of the time, people happen to conceive of children's caretakers as female. By extension, child care itself is gendered female, regardless of historical (or contemporary) practical realities."[207]

The woman and child figurines show a remarkable typological variety especially in regard to the woman-child relationship indicated by the different postures. Their interpretation should take into account these differences. Taking all sub-types of the woman and child figurines together, there are significant changes or developments in regard to the displayed relationship between woman and child. The smallest children, babies and infants, are being held close to the woman's body and strongly supported by both her hands and/or being placed on her lap (sub-types 2 and 3). This constellation is the only case in which the child does not face the front, as if he or she is unaware of the outside world and solely focused on and content within his or her relation to the woman. In the case of sub-type 1, the child is not a baby anymore. It can be held at the side by the woman's left hand only, and sits a little bit upright and faces the front. Furthermore, the child is in a way more "active" within the relationship by placing his or her hand on the woman's breast and/or shoulder. Both gestures intend to portray the close relationship and relatedness between woman and child. Considering the lack of visual interaction, the scenery is not so much about shared (personal) intimacy, but rather about the acts of feeding, nursing, and caring in the context of the bond between woman and child. Finally, sub-type 4 shows an even older child sitting on the woman's shoulder. While the child is still dependent on his or her caretaker (the woman holds the child's ankles and the child touches the woman's head), he or she is old enough to sit stable on the woman's shoulder. Thus, this image constellation reflects the child's lasting dependence on his or her caretaker while at the same time showing the child's growing "independence." Evidently, the woman and child figurines present a dynamic relationship between woman and child and different degrees of (in)dependence between them. The notion that "his [that is, the child's] attachment to his mother is purely

[206] See Schwyn 2000. For a general overview on children and childhood in the ancient Near East, see Meyer 2001 and Kunz-Lübcke 2007.

[207] Budin 2011: 333–334.

iconographical, as to allow his identification as a child"[208] is in light of these insights too simplistic and does not do justice to the variety of the figurines.

Considering the substantial responsibility and labor-intensive nature of caretaking (continuous physical and emotional demands, getting acquainted with breastfeeding, etc.), the imagery of the woman and child figurines seems more idealistic than realistic. "Indeed, the women depicted in these figurines seem immune to the whole host of chores and challenges that even mothers who breastfeed easily must deal with … . Often placed literally on a pedestal, this mother is both symbol and impossible standard, her openness to spectatorship implying that this perfect maternal ideal should be witnessed, understood, and emulated."[209] In the ancient world, lactation and nursing competency was crucial to child survival and embedded into a network of social and economic connections. The commodification of childbearing and nursing was conceptually and maybe even physically situated in the public sphere (be it only the extended family). Thus, the figurines do not only portray a physical and emotional bond between two individuals, but also the social space allotted to the woman and child relationship and their social roles therein. In accordance with Stephanie M. Langin-Hooper, this imagery could be understood as an iconography of service (to society). "Her body's ideal – even superlative – ability is available to serve not just the child, but everyone, just as the child too is nurtured primarily in service of peopling the community and facilitating future social connections."[210] It is interesting to note that within all sub-types of the woman and child figurines, the child is held or carried on the woman's left side, thus exposing the woman's right side to the eyes of the viewers. While a left-side preference on this kind of figurine is already visible in former times, it is by no means as exclusive as in Persian and early Hellenistic times. Thus, it cannot be simply explained by tradition history. In Mesopotamian art, it is the king's right side that is presented to the direct sight of the viewer in order to demonstrate his physical or political power.[211] Maybe a similar logic was at play in the case of woman and child figurines. By exposing the woman's (perfect and unblemished) right side to view, she is envisioned as a strong, powerful, and proactive caretaker and protector of the child.[212]

Even though Stern somehow overestimated the aspect of nudity by exclusively linking it to fertility, the aspect of nudity plays a significant role in the

[208] Erlich 2006: 53.

[209] Langin-Hopper 2020: 106–107.

[210] Langin-Hopper 2020: 110.

[211] Winter 1995: 2578.

[212] See Langin-Hooper 2020: 112. Based on recent psychological studies, she proposes another reason for the left-side preference: "Psychologically and neurologically, left-side placement of a child is ideal: for maternal health, for infant development, and – crucially – for enabling the child to develop successful relationships later in his or her social life."

iconography of the woman and child figurines. In methodological regard, it is important to first assess the degree of nudity and second assess the potential meanings linked to it. Usually, it is only the upper body of the woman, namely her breasts, that are nude and somehow accentuated. In cases where the figure is completely nude, there is no remarkable emphasis on, for instance, the pubic area. The exposed and sometimes supported (by the woman herself and/or the child) breasts are to be understood in continuity of female figurines (e.g., the Judean pillar figurines), representing the aspect of nursing and blessing (dea nutrix aspect).[213] Thus, the nudity of the woman and child figurines has nothing or only little to do with fertility, sexuality, and eroticism. In reference to the figurines from Maresha, which show clothing, Adi Erlich argues that the woman's sexual components are concealed and thus she is portrayed in an asexual manner.[214] For Erlich, the woman remains modest and hidden (underneath her cloth), which reflects an emphasis of motherhood over fertility and is caused by Greek influence.[215] By employing a Western approach to Eastern figurines in terms of general iconography, while they remained local in technique and style, this phenomenon can also be considered an excellent example of processes of hybridization.

Coming back to the question of interpretation, we have to admit that the iconography of the figurines cannot provide a clear-cut answer either. However, the results support an interpretation as a goddess by tendency. Considering the highly symbolic and idealized portrayal of the woman and child, it is not exactly clear what these kinds of votive offerings are supposed to aim at. Especially if the notion is true that the iconography does not focus on fertility and maternity as such it becomes harder to consider the figurines "as votive offerings presented to the deity in a request for divine assistance."[216] Also, the idea that the "figurines were presented to the deity by women applying for help or thanking the deity in an expressive way"[217] becomes rather doubtful.

On the other hand, the highly symbolic and idealized portrayal of woman and child (especially sub-types 1–3) fits a representation of a goddess (independent of her exact identification!). Furthermore, by highlighting aspects like life, vitality, nourishing, caretaking, and blessing, the image constellation is closely

[213] See Frevel 1994: 771 and Pyschny 2019: 139.

[214] Erlich 2006: 54.

[215] Ibid. See also the statement on the same page: "The frontal and prominent display of the child high above his mother is a new practice in the figurines of the region, and it might imply a shift from concern about potential for children, i.e. fertility, towards a concern for children themselves."

[216] Stern 2010: 443.

[217] Lipiński 2003: 301. He elaborates further: "Such votive offerings may record a ceremony of thanksgiving on the part of the mother shortly after the birth of her child or her ritual cleansing in the sanctuary after childbirth, as prescribed in Leviticus 12" (302).

linked to the divine sphere. Considering the typological continuity to the dea gravida figurines and the analogy to the Isis and Horus iconography, the interpretation as a goddess seems plausible.[218]

In sum: (a) The woman and child figurines present an excellent example for the mixture of Western motif and Eastern style. This holds true in typological, stylistic, and iconographic respect. (b) In addition, they also have typological continuities within Israel/Palestine going back to the late Bronze Age. These typological continuities also include certain similarities to the dea gravida figurines (see, for instance, the headdress and the rather seated posture). (c) Based on two sub-types of woman and child figurines, we established a link to the Isis and Horus iconography (see the example from Tel Ḥalif and the tendency towards seating in the case of the dea gravida figurines) which "transitions" in early Hellenistic times into the Aphrodite-Eros figurines. Of course, the degree of connection to Egyptian iconography varies from case to case and only single examples resemble Egyptian iconography in a narrow sense. However, there can be no doubt that the woman and child figurines are at least open for an Egyptian reception even though an identification as Isis is neither imperative nor necessary. This brings us finally to the necessary methodological remark or disclaimer. The discussion on identification was not aiming at nailing down the divine identity of the figurines. It rather aimed at opening up the field of possibilities. Often, it is not possible and sometimes not even useful to look for the identification of figurines. These identifications can be local and hard to uncover without the emic perspective. More important are the regional shifts in iconography and the description of continuities and discontinuities. However, the "game" of identifications can also be meaningful here.

4. Concluding Remarks and Prospects

One of the most persistent classification schemes for the corpus of (late) Persian figurines from the Southern Levant is the dichotomous differentiation between East and West. It was formed into an argumentative pattern in the groundbreaking work of Ephraim Stern, whose description of the evidence still has an incredible degree of accuracy. Nevertheless, his approach was highly driven by

[218] This does not mean that this kind of interpretation is imperative or should be applied to all sub-types alike. In fact, one cannot escape the impression that the oscillating between mortal iconography (e.g., the lack of clear divine attributes) and divine iconography (e.g., typological continuity to dea gravida figurines, seated posture, analogy to Isis and Horus iconography) is deeply embedded into the imagery of the woman and child figurines and is part of a sophisticated iconographic play of interpretation linked to aspects of feeding, nursing, and caring, which are considered the fields of competence of both goddesses and women.

the idea that Hellenization was superimposed onto local traditions which were deeply rooted in "Canaan." By challenging the underlying paradigm, we have tried to get one step ahead. For the sake of a more appropriate typological approach beyond dichotomies and towards a balanced relation between continuity and discontinuity, we first discussed the notion of Hellenization, second, reflected upon the concept of hybridity in mutual processes of cultural contact, and third, presented the degree of variance, East-West mixture, and regional particularities in regard to the hoards of figurines in the Persian and early Hellenistic period. Instead of first a Phoenician and then a Hellenized ecumene, we have emphasized regional aspects and mixed forms. In addition, we have tried to bring the East-West paradigm into limbo through a stronger influence of Egyptian iconography.

It became evident that a clear-cut distinction or differentiation between Persian and early Hellenistic figurines does not do justice to the material. Hoards from the coastal region, the Shephelah, and the region of Idumea, as well as their parallels from Phoenician sites such as Achzib and Kharayeb, attest to a rather transitional character in temporal and iconographical respect. The figurines reflect a certain amount of "hybridization" driven by contact, trade, fashion, and cultural influence.

In both test cases (the bearded man and the woman and child figurines), we have put emphasis on the particular iconographic details which characterized even the single figurine (and not necessarily the whole groups as such). By doing this, the following truism came up in the argument: Figurines can be read from different angles depending on the focus on certain characteristics within a composition of aspects. The atef-crown, for instance, can be read as a sign for an Egyptian background, and the himation may be understood as Western style, indicating that a type of figurine as such could be interpreted from various perspectives.

In this essay, we suggested to heuristically differentiate between typology, style, motif, and material production. On the one hand, we traced an influence supposedly moving from North to South; on the other hand, we realized an influence running counter-clockwise within Israel/Palestine. Motifs from the Late Bronze and Iron Age continued into the Persian and early Hellenistic periods including moments of continuity and discontinuity.

In a way, the difference between Hellenistic influence – or more precisely, influence from the Cyprian and Aegean material culture – and processes of Hellenization are self-evident. However, the balanced relation between continuity and discontinuity advises against the understanding of the (imported) figurines as a marker of a Hellenistic mindset. The evidence for Apollo, Osiris, or Isis, and all the more Heracles within the set of figurines attests to a broader temporal framework of influence. These figurines, which show local characteristics as

well as identification markers from the imported motifs, reflect the blurred categories of Hellenistic influences, local adaption, and processes of Hellenization. Playing the "game" of identification, it was striking that the female figurines are conceded much more to be a "type" than to depict a certain goddess. In contrast, the discussion on the bearded man figurines was much more obsessed with the attribution of names to the figurines' type.

Besides the great amount of continuity, the variants and variety of types, motifs, and style in the figurines from the Persian period was striking, as was the typological conformity around the province of Yehud in the West, North, and with certain emphasis in the South. Although the variance allows for the assumption of a regional development, to our understanding it does not seem appropriate to draw a clear-cut line between North and South, coast and inland, etc. In view of the various influences, it seems more appropriate to speak of the regions' connectivity and networking rather than of a dichotomy with a single point of geographical orientation.

If we accept the interpretation of Patrick Wyssmann[219] for the Samarian Coinage and Silvia Schroer and Florian Lippke[220] for the Wadi ed-Daliyeh bullae, we see parallels in regard to the transition from the Persian to the early Hellenistic period. It is remarkable that the same tendency – standardization on the one hand and "hybridization" on the other – evinces a more fluid or fuzzy understanding of "transition" into this period. We believe that this very aspect can be discussed also in regard to other object classes and even on the basis of the literary record.

We made two separate cases in which Egyptian influence may have played a greater role than commonly assumed in scholarship.[221] In light of the evidence for an Osiris cult attested by bronzes etc., the Egyptian character of certain elements within a type of figurines seems undervalued in recent debate. The atef-crown has to be explained against the background of the rise of Osiris even if one does not identify the examples in question with Osiris. We did not propose a single explanation for this phenomenon but rather hinted at the striking fact that most often the bearded man figurines with atef-crown were accompanied by the type(s) with Persian headdress.

Within the group of woman and child figurines, we suggested to evaluate the great variants of this motif as well as the continuity from the late Bronze Age onwards until the early Hellenistic period. Similar to the bearded men, there was a particular influence of or rather a connection to Egyptian iconography (Isis-Horus motif). Furthermore, we pointed out certain aspects of anthropological

[219] See Wyssmann 2014; 2019.

[220] See Schroer and Lippke 2014.

[221] The emphasis on the Egyptian influence is in accordance with some groundbreaking notes made by Bisi 1990: 80.

relations between woman and child expressed by the position of the child and hand/arm gestures. Despite the typological variety, even this particular aspect gives evidence for a great continuity within female terracotta figurines through the ages.

In sum: We applied a regional perspective alongside *longue durée* aspects to reevaluate elements of typology which are often taken as a given within scholarly debate. This volume's introduction pointed out gaps within the chronological framework which, interestingly enough, concern transition centuries, the 5th and the 3rd centuries in particular – the Babylonian and Persian period on the one hand and Persian and Hellenistic times on the other. In our opinion, this is part of the problem. This holds true especially in regard to figurines because the finds are pushed on typological grounds to one category or the other, due to a clear-cut separation in mind between the periods and a typological differentiation which sets the figurines apart.

In applying the term "hybridity" to our material in order to question the clear-cut borders between East and West in iconographic typology, we are aware of the most problematic implicitness of these borders. "Every aim to transcend borders starts with the acknowledgement of those borders, confirming the existence of what needs to be overcome."[222] This holds true not only in regard to the study of material culture, but also in regard to the scientific paradigms of the giants on whose shoulders we stand.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambar-Armon, Einat, 2007, *Oil Lamps in the Land of Israel during the Hellenistic Period in Light of the Finds from the Maresha Excavations. Conservatism and Tradition alongside Creativity and Innovation*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Bar-Ilan University.

Avigad, Nahman, 1960, Excavations at Makmish, 1958. Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 10/2, 90–96.

Avigad, Nahman, and Benjamin Sass, 1997, *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals* (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Section of Humanities), Jerusalem.

Avissar, Rona S., Joe Uziel, and Aren M. Maeir, 2007, Tell eṣ-Ṣāfi/Gath During the Persian Period, in: Yigael Levin (ed.), *A Time of Change. Judah and Its Neighbours in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods* (Library of Second Temple Studies 65), London, 65–115.

Berlin, Andrea M., and Rafael Frankel, 2012, The Sanctuary at Mizpe Yammim.

[222] Stockhammer 2012: 2.

Phoenician Cult and Territory in the Upper Galilee during the Persian Period: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 366, 25–78.

Betlyon, John W., 2005, A People Transformed. Palestine in the Persian Period: *Near Eastern Archaeology* 68, 4–58.

Bhabha, Homi K., 1994, *The Location of Culture*, New York.

Biran, Avraham, 1994, *Biblical Dan*, Jerusalem.

Bisi, Anna-Maria, 1990, Quelques remarques sur la coroplastie palestinienne à l'époque perse: Tradition locale et emprunts étrangers: *Transeuphratène* 3, 75–84.

Bliss, Frederick J., and Robert A. Stewart Macalister, 1902, *Excavations in Palestine during the Years 1898–1900*, London.

Bobou, Olympia, 2015, *Children in the Hellenistic World. Statues and Representation*, Oxford.

Bonnet, Corinne, 1988, *Melqart. Cultes et Mythes de l'Héraclès Tyrien en Méditerranée* (Studia Phoenicia 8), Leuven.

Bonnet, Corinne, 2007, Melqart, in: Christoph Uehlinger et al. (eds.), *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*; http://www.religionswissenschaft.uzh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_melqart.pdf (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Bonnet, Corinne, 2019, The Hellenistic Period and Hellenization in Phoenicia, in: Carolina López-Ruiz and Brian R. Doak (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, New York, 99–110.

Brandl, Baruch, 2000, Various Finds from Iron Age II and the Persian Period (Eighth-Fourth Centuries BCE), in: Yizhar Hirschfeld (ed.), *Ramat Hanadiv Excavations. Final Report of the 1984–1998 Seasons*, Jerusalem, 187–210.

Bricault, Laurent, and Versluys Miguel John, 2014, Isis and Empires, in: Laurent Bricault and Miguel John Versluys (eds.), *Power, Politics and the Cults of Isis*, Leiden/Boston, 3–35.

Budin, Stephanie L., 2011, *Images of Woman and Child from the Bronze Age. Reconsidering Fertility, Maternity, and Gender in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.

Burnett, Joel S., 2016, Egyptianizing Elements in Ammonite Stone Statuary. The Atef Crown and Lotus, in: Rolf A. Stucky, Oskar Kaelin, and Hans-Peter Mathys (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East: June 9–13, 2014, University of Basel, Vol. 1*, Wiesbaden, 57–69.

Çakmak, Lisa A., 2009, *Mixed Signals. Androgyny, Identity, and Iconography on the Graeco-Phoenician Sealings from Tel Kedesh, Israel*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.

Castiglione, Marianna, 2019, From Alexandria to Tyros. The Egyptian Character of the Hellenistic Figurines from Kharayeb, in: Giorgos Papantoniou,

Demetrios Michaelides, and Maria Dikomitou-Eliadou (eds.), *Hellenistic and Roman Terracottas* (Monumenta Graeca et Romana 23), Leiden, 359–370.

Ciasca, Antonia, 1963, Un deposito di statuette da Tell Gat: *Oriens Antiquus* 2, 45–63.

Cornelius, Izak, 2014, "East Meets West". Trends in Terracotta Figurines, in: Christian Frevel, Katharina Pyschny, and Izak Cornelius (eds.), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 267), Fribourg/Göttingen, 67–94.

Culican, William, 1968, The Iconography of Some Phoenician Seals and Seal Impressions: *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 1/1, 50–103.

Culican, William, 1969, Dea Tyria Gravida: *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 1/2, 35–50.

Daviau, P. M. Michèle, 2002, *Excavations at Tall Jawa, Jordan. Vol. II: The Iron Age Artefacts* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 11/2), Leiden.

Daviau, P. M. Michèle, 2014, The Coroplastics of Transjordan. Forming Techniques and Iconographic Traditions in the Iron Age, in: Stephanie M. Langin-Hooper (ed.), *Figuring Out the Figurines of the Ancient Near East* (Occasional Papers in Coroplastic Studies 1), sine loco, 1–13.

Daviau, P. M. Michèle, and Paul-Eugène Dion, 1994, El, the God of the Ammonites? The Atef-Crowned Head from Tell Jawa, Jordan: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 110/2, 158–167.

El-Khouri, Lamia Salem, 2002, *The Nabataean Terracotta Figurines* (BAR International Series 1034), Oxford.

Erickson, Kyle, and Nicholas L. Wright, 2011, The "Royal Archer" and Apollo in the East. Greco-Persian Iconography in the Seleukid Empire, in: Nicholas Holmes (ed.), *Proceedings of the XIVth International Numismatic Congress in Glasgow, August 30–September 3 2011*, Glasgow, 163–168.

Erlich, Adi, 2006, The Persian Period Terracotta Figurines from Maresha in Idumea. Local and Regional Aspects: *Transeuphratène* 32, 45–59.

Erlich, Adi, 2009, *The Art of Hellenistic Palestine* (BAR International Series 2010), Oxford.

Erlich, Adi, 2010, Figurines, Sculpture and Minor Art of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, in: Ephraim Stern and Adi Erlich (eds.), *Excavations at Dor. Figurines, Cult Objects and Amulets, 1980–2000 Seasons*, Jerusalem, 117–209.

Erlich, Adi, 2014, Terracotta Figurines, in: Ian Stern (ed.), *The Excavations of Maresha Subterranean Complex 57. The 'Heliodorus' Cave* (BAR International Series 2652), Oxford, 39–70.

Erlich, Adi, 2018, Terracotta Figurines, in: Orit Tsuf (ed.), *Ancient Jaffa from the Persian to the Byzantine Period. Kaplan Excavations (1955–1981)* (The Jaffa Cultural Heritage Project Series 3 / Ägypten und Altes Testament 89), Münster, 573–588.

Erlich, Adi, 2019a, On Figurines and Identity. An Inter-Site Study of Terracotta Figurines from Idumaea (South Israel) in the Persian Period, in: Giorgos Papantoniou, Christine E. Morris, and Athanasios K. Vionis (eds.), *Unlocking Sacred Landscapes. Spatial Analysis of Ritual and Cult in the Mediterranean* (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 151), Nicosia, 257–270.

Erlich, Adi, 2019b, Toward a Levantine Koine. Ties between Hellenistic Terracottas from Coele Syria and Cyprus, in: Giorgos Papantoniou, Demetrios Michaelides, and Maria Dikomitou-Eliadou (eds.), *Hellenistic and Roman Terracottas* (Monumenta Graeca et Romana 23), Leiden, 370–383.

Erlich, Adi, and Amos Kloner, 2008, *Maresha Excavations Final Report II. Hellenistic Terracotta Figurines from the 1989–1996 Seasons* (Israel Antiquities Authority Reports 35), Jerusalem.

Feldman, Marian H., 2019, Levantine Art in the "Orientalizing" Period, in: Carolina López-Ruiz and Brian R. Doak (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, New York, 370–383.

Finkielsztejn, Gérald, 2005, Quelques cultes ayant traversé l'époque perse (Anat-Io, Qôs-Appolon, Phanébal, Asklépios leontoukhos…). Ancienneté des cultes du Levant et interpretatio graeca: *Transeuphratène* 30, 187–188.

Fitzgerald, Gerald M., 1932, Excavations at Beth-Shan in 1931: *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* 64/3, 138–148.

Fletcher, Richard N., 2011, Greek-Levantine Cultural Exchange in Orientalising and Archaic Pottery Shapes: *Ancient West and East* 10, 11–42.

Fortner, Sandra A., 2008, *Die Keramik und Kleinfunde von Bethsaida-Iulias am See Genezareth, Israel*.
https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/8200/1/Fortner_Sandra.pdf (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Fourrier, Sabine, and Thomas Kiely, 2012, Excavations at Kition-Bamboula 1879. Finds in the British Museum: *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes* 42, 273–304.

Frankel, Rafael, and Raphael Ventura, 1998, The Miṣpe Yamim Bronzes: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 311, 39–55.

Frevel, Christian, 1994, *Aschera und der Ausschließlichkeitsanspruch YHWHs. Beiträge zu literarischen, religionsgeschichtlichen und ikonographischen Aspekten der Ascheradiskussion* (Bonner Biblische Beiträge 94), Weinheim.

Frevel, Christian, 2018, *Geschichte Israels* (Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 2), Stuttgart.

Frevel, Christian, and Katharina Pyschny, 2016, A Religious Revolution Devours Its Children. The Iconography of the Persian-Period Cuboid Incense Burners, in: Diana V. Edelman, Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley, and Phillippe Guillaume (eds.), *Religion in the Achaemenid Persian Empire. Emerging Judaisms and Trends* (Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 17), Tübingen, 91–133.

Frevel, Christian, Katharina Pyschny, and Izak Cornelius (eds.), 2014, *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 267), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Gerber, Jörg, 2006, Hellenization. A. Term, in: *Brill's New Pauly*; http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e506840 (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Graf, Fritz, and Anne Ley, 2006, Apollo, in: *Brill's New Pauly*; http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e128090 (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Griffiths, John G., 1980, *The Origins of Osiris and His Cult* (Studies in the History of Religions 40), Leiden.

Healey, John F., 2001, *The Religion of the Nabataeans. A Conspectus* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 136), Leiden.

Hengel, Martin, 2003, *The "Hellenization" of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*, London.

Herbert, Sharon C., 2003, The Hellenistic Archives from Tel Kedesh (Israel) and Seleucia-on-the-Tigris (Iraq): *Bulletin of the University of Michigan Museums of Art and Archaeology* 15, 65–86.

Herrmann, Christian, 2016, *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV. Von der Spätbronzezeit IIB bis in römische Zeit* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 38), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Hirschfeld, Yizhar, and Orit Peleg, 2005, An Early Roman Gemstone Depicting Apollo Found at Rāmat ha-Nādīv: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 121, 59–66.

de Hulster, Izaak J., 2017, *Figurines in Achaemenid Period Yehud. Jerusalem's History of Religion and Coroplastics in the Monotheism Debate* (Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 26), Tübingen.

Iliffe, John H., 1935, A Hoard of Bronzes from Askalon c. Fourth Century B.C.: *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 5, 61–68.

Jacobs, Paul F., 2015, *Lahav IV. The Figurines of Tell Halif*, Winona Lake.

James, Frances W., 1966, *The Iron Age at Beth Shan. A Study of Levels VI–IV* (Museum Monographs 18), Philadelphia.

Kamlah, Jens, 1999, Zwei nordpalästinische "Heiligtümer" der persischen Zeit und ihre epigraphischen Funde: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 115/2, 163–190.

Karageorghis, Vassos, 1999, *The Coroplastic Art of Ancient Cyprus V. The Cypro-Archaic Period: Small Female Figurines B: Figurines moulées*, Nicosia.

Karageorghis, Vassos, Gloria S. Merker, and Joan R. Mertens, 2016, *The Cesnola Collection of Cypriot Art. Terracottas*, New Haven.

Karlin, Margo, and Eilat Mazar, 2013, The Seated Male Terracotta Figurine, in: Eilat Mazar (ed.), *The Northern Cemetery of Achziv (10th–6th Centuries BCE). The Tophet Site* (Cuadernos de arqueología mediterránea 19–20), Barcelona, 255–258.

Keel, Othmar, 1997, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Band I: Von Tell Abu Farağ bis 'Atlit* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 13), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar, 2010a, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel Eton* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 29), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar, 2010b, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Band III: Von Tell el-Far'a Nord bis Tell el-Fir* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 31), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar, 2013, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Band IV: Von Tel Gamma bis Chirbet Husche* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 33), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar, 2017, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Band V: Von Tel el-'Idham bis Tel Kitan* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 35), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Keel, Othmar, and Max Küchler, 1982, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel. Ein Handbuch und Studienreiseführer zum Heiligen Land. Band 2: Der Süden*, Zürich.

Keel, Othmar, and Silvia Schroer, 2004, *Eva – Mutter alles Lebendigen. Frauen- und Göttinnenidole aus dem Alten Orient*, Fribourg.

Keel, Othmar, and Christoph Uehlinger, 1998, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*, Minneapolis.

Kletter, Raz, Irit Ziffer, and Wolfgang Zwickel, 2010, *Yavneh I. The Excavation of the "Temple Hill" Repository Pit and the Cult Stands* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 30), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Knauf, Ernst Axel, 1998, Qôs, in: Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden, 674–677.

Kunz-Lübcke, Andreas, 2007, *Das Kind in den antiken Kulturen des Mittelmeers. Israel – Ägypten – Griechenland*, Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Langin-Hooper, Stephanie M., 2020, *Figurines in Hellenistic Babylonia. Miniaturization and Cultural Hybridity*, Cambridge.

Leith, Mary J. W., 1997, *Wadi Daliyeh I. The Wadi Daliyeh Seal Impressions* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 24), Oxford.

Lichtenberger, Achim, 2003, *Kulte und Kultur der Dekapolis. Untersuchungen zu numismatischen, archäologischen und epigraphischen Zeugnissen* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins 29), Wiesbaden.

von Lieven, Alexandra, 2006, Seth ist im Recht, Osiris ist im Unrecht! Sethkultorte und ihre Version des Osiris-Mythos: *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 133/2, 141–150.

Lipiński, Edward, 2003, Phoenician Cult Expressions in the Persian Period, in: William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin (eds.), *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past. Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina. Proceedings of the Centennial Symposium W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, May 29–31, 2000*, Winona Lake, 297–308.

Lippke, Florian, 2013, "Über den Jordan" oder "zum Bach Ägyptens"? Zur Frage der Einflüsse der ägyptischen Todes- und Jenseitsvorstellungen auf die biblische (südlevantinische) Welt, in: Predrag Bukovec and Barbara Kolkmann-Klamt (eds.), *Jenseitsvorstellungen im Orient. Kongressakten der 2. Tagung der RVO, 3./4. Juni 2011, Tübingen* (Religionen im Vorderen Orient 1), Hamburg, 65–100.

Mackenthun, Gesa, 2010, Von Hybriden und Geisterschiffen. Metaphern im postkolonialen Wissenschaftsdiskurs, in: Matthias Junge (ed.), *Metaphern in Wissenskulturen*, Wiesbaden, 123–139.

Maillard, Pauline, 2019, *Les terres cuites des Salines de Kition. Étude d'un culte chypriote d'époque classique*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Lausanne.

Martin, Susan R., 2007, *"Hellenization" and Southern Phoenicia. Reconsidering the Impact of Greece Before Alexander*, Ann Arbor, MI.

Martin, Susan R., 2017, *The Art of Contact. Comparative Approaches to Greek and Phoenician Art*, Philadelphia.

Mazar, Eilat, 2001, *The Phoenicians in Achziv, the Southern Cemetery. Jerome L. Joss Expedition. Final Report of the Excavations, 1988–1990* (Cuadernos de arqueología mediterránea 7), Barcelona.

McInerney, Jeremy, 2014, *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, New York.

McKenzie, Judith S., 2013, Architecture and Phases, in: Judith S. McKenzie et al. (eds.), *The Nabataean Temple at Khirbet et-Tannur, Jordan. Vol. I: Architecture and Religion. Final Report on Nelson Glueck's Excavation* (The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 67), Boston, 39–188.

McKenzie, Judith S., Sheila Gibson, and A. T. Reyes, 2002, Reconstruction of the Nabataean Temple Complex at Khirbet et-Tannur: *Palestine Exploration Quaterly* 134, 44–83.

Meyer, Jan-Waalke, 2001, Kind und Kindheit im Alten Orient, in: Gerald Scholz and Alexander Ruhl (eds.), *Perspektiven auf Kindheit und Kinder*, Wiesbaden, 215–233.

Meyers, Eric M., and Mark A. Chancey, 2012, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible. Vol 3: Alexander to Constantine* (Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library), New Haven.

Moorey, Peter R. S., 2000, Iran and the West. The Case of the Terracotta "Persian" Riders in the Achaemenid Empire, in: Reinhard Dittmann et al. (eds.), *Variatio Delectat. Iran und der Westen* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 272), Münster, 469–486.

Nakhai, Beth A., 2014, Mother-and-Child Figurines in the Levant from the Late Bronze Age through the Persian Period, in: John R. Spencer, Robert A. Mullins, and Aaron J. Brody (eds.), *Material Culture Matters. Essays on the Archaeology of the Southern Levant in Honor of Seymour Gitin*, Winona Lake, 165–198.

Negbi, Ora, 1966, *A Deposit of Terracottas and Statuettes from Tel Sippor* (Atiqot 6), Jerusalem.

Niehr, Herbert, 2003, *Ba'alšamem. Studien zu Herkunft, Geschichte und Rezeptionsgeschichte eines phönizischen Gottes* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 123), Leuven.

Niehr, Herbert, 2008, Baal Hammon, in: Christoph Uehlinger et al. (eds.), *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*; http://www.religionswissenschaft.uzh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_baal_hammon.pdf (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Niehr, Herbert, 2010, Baalshamem/Belshamim, in: Christoph Uehlinger et al. (eds.), *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*; http://www.religionswissenschaft.uzh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_baalshamem.pdf (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Nunn, Astrid, 2000, *Der figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordaniens vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 18), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Nunn, Astrid, 2014, Attic Pottery Imports and Their Impact on "Identity Discourses". A Reassessment, in: Christian Frevel, Katharina Pyschny, and Izak Cornelius (eds.), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 267), Fribourg/Göttingen, 391–429.

Oggiano, Ida, 2015a, Le sanctuaire de Kharayeb et l'évolution de l'imagerie Phénicienne dans l'arrière-pays de Tyr, in: Julien Aliquot and Corinne

Bonnet (eds.), *La Phénicie hellénistique. Actes du colloque international de Toulouse (18–20 février 2013)* (Topoi Supplément 13), Lyon, 239–266.

Oggiano, Ida, 2015b, The Question of "Plasticity" of Ethnic and Cultural Identity. The Case Study of Kharayeb, in: Anne-Marie Maïla-Afeiche (ed.), *Cult and Ritual on the Levantine Coast and Its Impact on the Eastern Mediterranean Realm. Proceedings of the International Symposium Beirut 2012* (Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises – BAAL Hors-Série 10), Beirut, 507–528.

Parlasca, Ingemarie, 1990, Terrakotten aus Petra. Ein neues Kapitel nabatäischer Archäologie, in: Fawzi Zayadine (ed.), *Petra and the Caravan Cities*, Amman, 87–105.

Pasche Guignard, Florence, Giulia Pedrucci, and Marianna Scapini, 2017, *Maternità e politeismi. Motherhood(s) and Polytheisms* (Collana di antropologia delle religioni 4), Bologna.

Press, Michael D., 2012, *Ashkelon 4. The Iron Age Figurines of Ashkelon and Philistia*, Winona Lake.

Pritchard, James B., 1988, *Sarepta IV. The Objects from Area II, X* (The University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania Excavations at Sarafand, Lebanon 4), Beyrouth.

Pruß, Alexander, 2013, Terrakotten, in: Michael P. Streck (ed.), *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie. Vol. 13*, Berlin, 603–610.

Pyschny, Katharina, 2019, Concepts and Contexts of Female and Male Nudity in the Iconography of the Southern Levant, in: Christoph Berner et al. (eds.), *Clothing and Nudity in the Hebrew Bible*, London, 127–161.

Quack, Joachim F., 2017, Resting in Pieces and Integrating the Oikoumene. On the Mental Expansion of the Religious Landscape by Means of the Body Parts of Osiris, in: Svenja Nagel, Joachim F. Quack, and Christian Witschel (eds.), *Entangled Worlds. Religious Confluences Between East and West in the Roman Empire* (Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 22), Tübingen, 244–273.

Rademacher, Claudia, 1999, Ein "Liebeslied für Bastarde"? Anmerkungen zum Hybridisierungskonzept im Globalisierungsdiskurs, in: Claudia Rademacher, Markus Schroer, and Peter Wiechens (eds.), *Spiel ohne Grenzen? Ambivalenzen der Globalisierung*, Wiesbaden, 255–269.

Rainey, Anson F., 1989, The "Lord of Heaven" at Tel Michal, in: Zeev Herzog et al. (eds.), *Excavations at Tel Michal, Israel*, Minneapolis, 381–382.

Riis, Poul J., 1979, *Sūkās VI. The Graeco-Phoenician Cemetery and Sanctuary at the Southern Harbour* (Publications of the Carlsberg Expedition to Phoenicia 7), Kopenhagen.

Roll, Israel, and Etan Ayalon, 1993, Apollonia-Arsuf, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land, Vol. 1*, Jerusalem, 72–75.

Roll, Israel, and Oren Tal, 1999, *Apollonia-Arsuf. Final Report of the Excavations I. The Persian and Hellenistic Periods (with Appendices of the Chalcolithic and Iron Age II Remains)* (Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology 16), Jerusalem.

Rośoł, Rafał, 2007, Die Herkunft des Gottesnamens Apollon: *Glotta* 83, 222–242.

Schmitt, Rüdiger, 2003, Gab es einen Bildersturm nach dem Exil? Einige Bemerkungen zur Verwendung von Terrakottafigurinen im nachexilischen Israel, in: Rainer Albertz and Bob Becking (eds.), *Yahwism after the Exile. Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Era* (Studies in Theology and Religion 5), Assen, 186–198.

Schroer, Silvia, 2018, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient. Eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern. Band 4: Die Eisenzeit bis zum Beginn der achämenidischen Herrschaft*, Basel.

Schroer, Silvia, and Florian Lippke, 2014, Beobachtungen zu den (spät-) persischen Samaria-Bullen aus dem Wadi ed-Daliyeh. Hellenisches, Persisches und Lokaltraditionen im Grenzgebiet der Provinz Yehûd, in: Christian Frevel, Katharina Pyschny, and Izak Cornelius (eds.), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 267), Fribourg/Göttingen, 305–390.

Schwyn, Irène, 2000, Kinderbetreuung im 9.–7. Jahrhundert. Eine Untersuchung anhand der Darstellungen auf neuassyrischen Reliefs: *lectio difficilior* 1/2000. http://www.lectio.unibe.ch/00_1/1-2000-k.pdf (last accessed: 1 August 2022).

Simon, Erika, 2007, Frühe Apollonbilder und das Problem früher Zeusbilder, in: Brigitte Groneberg and Hermann Spieckermann (eds.), *Die Welt der Götterbilder* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 376), Berlin, 169–182.

Skupinska-Løvset, Ilona, 1978, *The Ustinow Collection. Terracottas*, Oslo et al.

Skupinska-Løvset, Ilona, 2014, The Cult of Astarte in Bethsaida and Kinneret? Interpretation of Female Figurines Excavated on et-Tell and Tell el-Ghureimeh, in: J. Harold Ellens (ed.), *Bethsaida in Archaeology, History and Ancient Culture. A Festschrift in Honor of John T. Greene*, Newcastle upon Tyne, 63–83.

Stager, Lawrence E., Daniel M. Master, and J. David Schloen, 2008, *Ashkelon 1. Introduction and Overview (1985–2006)* (Final Reports of the Leon Levy Expedition to Ashkelon), Winona Lake.

Stern, Ephraim, 1975, A Deposit of Votive Figurines from the Beer-Sheba Region: *Eretz Israel* 12, 92–93.

Stern, Ephraim, 1982, *The Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period 538–332 B.C.*, Jerusalem.

Stern, Ephraim, 1984, The Archaeology of Persian Palestine, in: William D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism. Vol. 1: Introduction: The Persian Period*, Cambridge, 88–114.

Stern, Ephraim, 2000, *Dor. Ruler of the Seas*, Jerusalem.

Stern, Ephraim, 2001, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible. Vol. 2: The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods (732–332 B.C.E.)* (Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library), New York.

Stern, Ephraim, 2010, Figurines and Cult Objects of the Iron Age and Persian Period, in: Ephraim Stern (ed.), *Excavations at Dor. Figurines, Cult Objects, and Amulets, 1980–2000 Seasons*, Jerusalem, 3–116.

Stockhammer, Philipp W., 2012, Questioning Hybridity, in: Id. (ed.), *Conceptualizing Cultural Hybridization. A Transdisciplinary Approach*, Berlin, 1–3.

Straßburger, Nicole, 2018, *Heilige Abfallgruben: Favissae und Kultdeposite in Israel/Palästina von der Spätbronzezeit bis zur Perserzeit* (Ägypten und Altes Testament 92), Münster.

Sulimani, Iris, 2015, Egyptian Heroes Travelling in Hellenistic Road Networks. The Representation of the Journeys of Osiris and Sesostris in Diodorus: *ARAM Periodical* 27, 87–102.

Teixidor, Javier, 1977, *The Pagan God. Popular Religion in the Greco-Roman Near East*, Princeton.

Tufnell, Olga, 1953, *Lachish III (Tell ed-Duweir). The Iron Age: Plates*, London.

Tyson, Craig W., 2019, The Religion of the Ammonites. A Specimen of Levantine Religion from the Iron Age II (ca. 1000–500 BCE): *Religions* 10, 153; doi:10.3390/rel10030153 (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Uehlinger, Christoph, 1992, Audienz in der Götterwelt. Anthropomorphismus und Soziomorphismus in der Ikonographie eines altsyrischen Zylindersiegels: *Ugarit-Forschungen* 24, 339–359.

Ulbrich, Anja, 2019, Hellenistic and Roman Terracottas in the Cypriot Collection of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. Contexts, Iconography, Meaning and Mediterranean Connections, in: Giorgos Papantoniou, Demetrios Michaelides, and Maria Dikomitou-Eliadou (eds.), *Hellenistic and Roman Terracottas* (Monumenta Graeca et Romana 23), Leiden, 146–162.

Van der Kooij, Gerrit, and Moawiyah M. Ibrahim (eds.), 1989, *Picking up the Threads. A Continuing Review of Excavations at Deir Alla, Jordan*, Leiden.

Wenning, Robert, 2009, The Message of the Khirbat at-Tannūr Reliefs: *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan* 10, 577–584.

Whiting, Marlena, and Hannah Wellman, 2016, *"A Gem of a Small Nabataean Temple". Excavations at Khirbet et-Tannur in Jordan*, Oxford.

Winter, Irene J., 1995, Aesthetics in Ancient Mesopotamian Art, in: Jack M. Sasson (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East. Vol. 4*, New York, 2569–2580.

Winter, Urs, 1983, *Frau und Göttin. Exegetische und ikonographische Studien zum weiblichen Gottesbild im Alten Israel und in dessen Umwelt* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 53), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Wuttmann, Michel, Laurent Coulon, and Florence Gombert, 2007, An Assemblage of Bronze Statuettes in a Cult Context. The Temple of ʿAyn Manâwir (Kharga Oasis), in: Martha Hill (ed.), *Offrandes aux dieux d'Égypte*, Martigny, 167–173.

Wyssmann, Patrick, 2014, The Coinage Imagery of Samaria and Judah in the Late Persian Period, in: Christian Frevel, Katharina Pyschny, and Izak Cornelius (eds.), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 267), Fribourg/Göttingen, 221–266.

Wyssmann, Patrick, 2019, *Vielfältig geprägt. Das spätperserzeitliche Samaria und seine Münzbilder* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 288), Leuven.

Yon, Marguerite, and Annie Caubet, 2010, Les figurines de terre cuite: *Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes* 40, 55–86.

Zwickel, Wolfgang, 2017, *Settlement History around the Sea of Galilee from the Neolithic to the Persian Period* (Ägypten und Altes Testament 86), Münster.

TRADE, CHARM, OR CULT? BES VASES IN THE SOUTHERN LEVANT DURING THE PERSIAN PERIOD

Ulrich Hofeditz

Like images objects can be in transition too. Images can be analyzed by their iconography, their composition and their context. Changes in style, new composition of single motifs or the missing of specific motifs in a defined corpus of cultural art can indicate changes in meaning or highlight specific aspects through cross-cultural use.

In the following article I will analyze the so called Bes vases, which were found in the Southern Levant[1]*, and their known context, and then compare them with those found in Egypt. The main focus, however, will be on their particular iconography and their possible use derived from the context they were found in.*

Bes vases are jugs or juglets. The body of the vases is often impressed to model eye holes; incisions often depict the hair of the beard. Eyes, nose, and ears are attached with additional clay. Eyebrows, if shown at all, are sometimes incised and sometimes modeled.[2]

In Egypt, Bes vases occur in the time of the New Kingdom and again in the Late Period, which corresponds to the Persian period, until the Graeco-Roman period. In the Southern Levant they are mainly found in contexts that relate to the time of the reign of the Achaemenids.[3]

1. The Corpus

So far a total of 16 Bes vases have been found in the Southern Levant. Most of them were found in regular excavations and only very few were bought on the antiquities market, the latter being those that raise the most questions.

[1] The area includes the countries of Israel, Jordan, and Palestine.

[2] The phenomenon of vessels in form of a human body is not seldom cf. Kipfer and Schroer 2015.

[3] A complete catalogue of known Bes vases from Egypt and other countries until 2003 was compiled by Kevin R. Kaiser (Kaiser 2003). He points out that 274 examples of Bes vases were from the Persian time, 59 from the New Kingdom and 51 examples from Graeco-Roman times (Kaiser 2003: 350). Cf. now also Rees et al. 2024 publishing a further fragment of an anthropomorphic vessel that was found in the Giv'ati Parking Lot excavations in Jerusalem.

The first vase known from the Southern Levant was excavated by George A. Reisner and others during the Samaria Excavations between 1908 and 1910.[4] The first publication shows just a small drawing with few details. The first photographs were published by Ephraim Stern around fifty years later.[5] A second vase mentioned by Reisner and others were never published and the object's present location is unknown.[6]

At the same time, between 1911 and 1913, another vase was found during the excavations of an ancient cemetery at Deve Hüyük in Northern Syria. It was first published by Charles L. Woolley[7] and later the excavation results were republished and more precisely dated to the 5th century BCE by P.R.S. Moorey. He thought that the deceased were various members of the Iranian army, who were buried with some of their weapons and personal goods.[8]

At least seven Bes vases were found by Flinders Petrie in his excavation at Tell Jemmeh between 1927 and 1928. Petrie published a few small drawings with very few details of the vases.[9] Some of the vessels were photographically republished by Stern, the remaining by Jeffrey A. Blakely and Fred L. Horton.[10] Even if there is no clear archaeological context mentioned, the level in which the objects had been found dates to the Persian period.[11]

Tell Jemmeh is the place, where the Bes vases from the Southern Levant have been found closest to the Egyptian border. Only a few kilometers to the northeast lies Tell el-Ḥesi. This area was first excavated by Petrie and Frederick J. Bliss between 1890 and 1892. A renewed excavation between 1970 and 1983 by G. Ernest Wright discovered two Bes vases in the Persian period strata. Sherds of the first vase were found in a pit (Pit 12.249; Bennett and Blakely 1989: 31 Fig. 23) and a reconstruction was possible. Just one sherd is known from the second one. Its archaeological context is not clear. The sherd from the body has traces of eyes and a nose, which seems to depict a Bes face.[12]

[4] Reisner et al. 1924: 281, III 2.

[5] Stern 1976b: 70 (top right).

[6] Reisner et al. 1924: 286, Stern 1976a: 182, Fn. 4; Kaiser 2003: 39, Fn. 87.

[7] Woolley 1914–1916: 126. Few further notes of this excavation were published in Woolley 1914.

[8] Moorey 1975: 115–116.

[9] Petrie 1928: 22ff, PI. LIX.

[10] Stern 1976a: Blakely and Horton 1986. Since vase (V76) is lost, only the drawing by Petrie's publication does exist.

[11] Petrie dated the two phases A-B between 650 and 500 BCE (Petrie 1928: 24). His results have been widely discussed. After the re-examination of Petrie's conclusions, scholars assert that there are three phases at Tell el-Ḥesi, which date from the late 6th to the 4th century BCE, cf. Stern 2001: 413.

[12] Blakely and Horton 1986; Bennett and Blakely 1989: 217f.

In the course of his excavations at Tel Mevorakh between 1973 and 1974 Stern discovered sherds of a Bes vase between Stratum IV and V.[13] Later on he found another Bes vase during his excavations at Tel Dor. The sherds were discovered under the floor in an area where supposedly a storehouse was located during the Persian period (Area D2, Locus 15092).[14] In 1991 one last Bes vase was found in a grave at Tel Haror, which has been excavated by Eliezer Oren and others.[15]

If not mentioned otherwise there is no clear archaeological context of the Bes vases presented in this paper.

There are two more Bes vases known from the Southern Levant, which were bought on the antiquities market. One, in the Carmen and Louis Warschaw Collection in Los Angeles, was first published by Stern, having supposedly been found in the Samaria region.[16] A second vase, also first published by Stern, is part of the Moshe Dayan Collection, which now belongs to the Israel Museum in Jerusalem. According to Stern the vase was discovered on a site in southern Palestine and dates back to the 7th or 6th century BCE.[17]

2. Typology of the Vases

The general outline of the iconography of the Bes vases has been shown above. In my analysis I only included those which can be reconstructed, i.e. two from Tell Jemmeh (**Cat. No. 5**, **Cat. No. 6**), a vase from Tel Dor (**Cat. No. 1**), one from Tel Haror (**Cat. No. 2**), one from Deve Hüyük (**Cat. No. 4**), and two vases, which were bought on the antiquities market (**Cat. No. 8**, **Cat. No. 9**).

All vases which are found in regular excavations are typical jugs or juglets. Stern distinguishes those "with a low ring base, a piriform body and a distinctive angular shoulder" (**Cat. No. 4**; **Cat. No. 5**) from those with "rounded, globular body and sloping shoulders" (**Cat. No. 6**, **Cat. No. 9**).[18]

In contrast, the classification by Blakely and Horton is based on the iconographic details. They suggest three different types: Type 1 "The Bes juglet" comprises "small, coarse juglets" (no picture). Type 2 "The Large Bes Vessel"

[13] Stern 1976a; Stern 1976b; Stern 1978: 43.

[14] *Area D2* (02.06.2014), Stern and Sharon 1995: 30f; Stern 2010: 30–32. The publication of the two vases, especially the one from Dor, poses some questions, because Stern published the reconstruction without highlighting the reconstructed parts. The difference becomes clear in comparison to the published pictures in the preliminary report, which shows only the original sherds glued together.

[15] Oren et al. 1991: 18.

[16] Stern 1976a: 183, Pl. 33:A.

[17] Stern 1976a: 187, Pl. 32:D; Ornan 1986: 40f.

[18] Stern 1976a: 185.

includes only the fragments of Tell Mevorakh (**Cat. No. 7**), which "appears to be […] large wheel-made" and has the most significant decoration. Type 3 is called "The Fine Bes Jug," because their clay is not coarse as it is in the other groups. This last group is subdivided into "vessels having faces of relatively simple features [type 3a] … and those having more involved features and a standardized form [type 3b]." Type 3 is the one found most frequently in the Southern Levant (**Cat. No. 5** and **Cat. No. 6** belong to Type 3a, while **Cat. No. 4** and **Cat. No. 3** belong to Type 3b).[19]

It is noteworthy, that both systems mainly differ in the classification of **Cat. No. 5**. Blakely and Horton as well as Stern try to identify the vessel in the local pottery typology. Blakely and Horton link them with Idumite Pottery.[20] Stern however identifies it as Iron Age II C Phoenician water decanter from Northern Israel and the Phoenician coast. Both identifications are unlikely.[21]

Stern's observation is correct that there have been similar forms in the Phoenician Iron Age Pottery.[22] Especially the double rim is a strong connection. But an important argument is the chronological distance. There is no reason to believe that the type was only used for Bes vases in the Persian period and mundane usage stopped.

Since a higher number of Bes vases was found in Egypt, it is necessary to analyze the connection of the specimens found in the Southern Levant and Egypt.

3. The Place of Production

In 2015 Ephraim Stern still suggested that the Bes vases from the Southern Levant are in fact Phoenician copies of the ones from Egypt.[23] Lisa Kuchman Sabbahy, who initially discussed the connection between the vases found in the Southern Levant and those from Egypt, also considered the Levantine vessels to be imitations. She argued that the form of the ware is the same, "but the facial representation is not carefully reproduced" since details especially on the vases from Tell Jemmeh are not clear and arms are missing.[24]

[19] Blakely and Horton 1986: 115.
[20] Blakely and Horton 1986: 118.
[21] Stern 1976a: 185; cf. Stern 2010: 30.
[22] Stern 2015a: Plate 4.1.21 No. 7 & 8.
[23] Stern 2015b: 578. Long before Stern Woolley suggested that the Bes vases were imitations; Woolley 1914–1916: 126.
[24] Kuchman Sabbahy 1982: 148.

Many Egyptologists like Kaiser never made a distinction between those vases found in Egypt und those found in the Southern Levant.[25] Kaiser is rather surprised by Kuchman Shabahy's arguments, since she described the vases from Tell Jemmeh as made from marl clay, which can only be found in the Fayyum and in the Memphite area, but not in the Levant.[26]

Next to form and material there is a third argument for the import theory: the geographic distribution. Most of the objects were found in places close to the Egyptian border. Furthermore Tell el-Ḥesi as well as Tell Jemmeh can be described as military centers[27] and also the graveyard at Deve Hüyük is closely connected with military personnel. Since soldiers are – like merchants – a highly mobile group, it is no wonder to find individual items in the context described above without having to argue for local production.[28]

For the Bes vases from Egypt it is possible to distinguish between two very similar classifications. The first was published by David and Barbara Aston. It was later on republished and extended by Kevin Kaiser.

They distinguish six different types. Types 1 to 4 are not relevant here because they do not occur in the Southern Levant. Just the three small vessels may belong to type 4. It is noteworthy that they are made of Nile silt and have a coarse quality. All small vessels found in the Southern Levant belong to the fourth group.

More important for our discussion are groups 5 and 6. This fine ware is made of marl 2 and 3 clay. Type 5 has a "ledge rim," and "one or more 'collar' ridges may appear on the neck and/or at the base of the neck. The eyes, nose, mouth, eyebrows, ears, and arms – which do not appear in the Southern Levant – are usually modeled from applied lumps of clay; secondarily the eyes are impressed with an annular implement or pricked with a tool. A small circular impression may also appear in the center of the forehead. Incised moustaches and beards are common, headdresses rare."[29] The specimens from Deve Hüyük (**Cat. No. 4**) and Tell el-Ḥesi (**Cat. No. 3**) belong to type 5.

Type 6 is very similar to type 5. Those vases "rarely have a ring base; bases are round, or flattened with a pointed centre, and the facial features are schematic; the mouth usually lacking, the eyes, nose and ears are simply applied lumps of clay, though a slit is sometimes incised in the eyes."[30] This group does

[25] Guidotti 1983: 48; Aston and Aston 2003: 102–106; Kaiser 2003: 40.

[26] Kuchman Sabbahy 1982: 147; Kaiser 2003: 47.

[27] Stern 2001: 411f.

[28] Catherine Defernez presents the idea, that the vases were imitations of metal vessels, which could only apply though to those found in Egypt. Defernez 2010: 115ff.

[29] Aston and Aston 2003: 103.

[30] Aston and Aston 2003: 106.

not contain many finds in Egypt. But most of the objects found in the Southern Levant can be classified as type 6. This resembles the proposal of Blakely and Horton.

Very important will be the publication of the recent excavations at Tell el-Herr. The excavators found 92 Bes vases in a fortified place dated to the time of the Achaemenids. The preliminary publications of Catherine Defernez show a reworked classification system and specific dates for the development of specific forms. Especially the fine ware vessels, defined as type C and type J, show a development from the third quarter of the 5th century BCE to the third quarter of the 4th century BCE.[31]

Defernez' analysis also confirms the date of the Bes vases from the Southern Levant. Moorey dated the cemetery of Deve Hüyük to the 5th century BCE. The vessel found there is one of the earliest pieces. The fine ware types from Tell Jemmeh, dated by Blakely and Horton to "possibly before … 350 BCE,"[32] represent the younger group.

Contrary to what Kuchman Shabahy suggested the Bes vases found in the Southern Levant are in fact not unusual among type 6 of Astons' and Kaiser's typology. It is noteworthy that the arms are missing on all finds from the Southern Levant. Furthermore, the strict use of a form similar to the Phoenician water decanter does not closely resemble the broad variety of vases found in Egypt.

The discussion of form and material shows the high probability of a production area in Egypt and not in the Southern Levant. Therefore, we can assume that those objects were imports. A petrographic examination of the Bes vases would be necessary to confirm this conclusion.[33]

4. Iconographical Analysis

As we have seen most types of vessels used for the Bes vases are jugs or decanters: a large, round body, a thin long neck and at the top a convex opening of the mouth. This form resembles the depiction of Bes in iconography. The form itself represents the head and feather-crown of Bes, similar to a faience pendant found

[31] Defernez 2009; Defernez 2010. Even more Bes vases are being discovered during ongoing excavations as in Saqqara (Lecuyot 2009) and Memphis (Yarmolovich 2015).

[32] Blakely and Horton 1986: 117.

[33] As Kaiser concludes all vessels are made from silt 1 of the type, which is not found in the Southern Levant. Stern describes the specimens found at Samaria as made of local pinkish clay and the one from Tel Mevorakh as made from local pinkish-brown clay (Stern 1976a: 183).

in Persepolis (**Fig. 1**). Other vessels used in Egypt such as ovoid or bag-shaped jars or goblets do not resemble the form of Bes.[34]

The determining elements of the dwarf-god Bes in Egyptian art are his depiction as a "frontal figure with bandy legs, his arms bent and his hands resting on his legs. He normally wears a feather crown, and the tail of a lion-skin is often visible between his legs."[35] His square cut beard varies in the Saitic period and sometimes includes spirals.[36]

Fig. 1: Faience pendant from Persepolis (Razmjou 2005: 172).

It is not possible to include most of these elements in the representation as a vase, so his bent arms are added on the vases in Egypt. Futhermore, Bes shows characteristics of a lion.[37] His roaring grimace with typical round ears, wild eyebrows, a snout with whiskers, and the beard, reminiscent of a mane, make this particularly clear – also on Egyptian Bes vases.[38]

As in Egypt, Bes was also popular in the Southern Levant and in Mesopotamia. The frontal depiction of Bes suggests that his origin is the East and not Egypt. Even the name Bes occurs there earlier.[39]

During Iron Age in the Southern Levant there are a lot of examples of Bes images on different material. His iconography is manifold, but the elements of the bent legs and arms and especially the feather crown are very common. The two Bes drawings found on a pithos in Kuntillet ʿAjrud, to mention a very prominent example, show exactly these elements as well as the lion face and the tail between the legs (occasionally also interpreted as a penis).[40]

[34] Compare types 1–4 in Aston and Aston 2003; Kaiser 2003.
[35] Wilson 1975: 77.
[36] Wilson 1975: 78.
[37] Velde 1999: 330.
[38] The study of Vaelske provides a compilation of the depiction of Bes in the Late Period in Egypt (Vaelske 2022: 403–407).
[39] Wilson 1975: 83.
[40] Cf. Schroer 2018: No. 1494.

A few small faiences from Gezer and Tell Jemmeh show that even a reduction of the head of Bes seemed sufficient to those, who wished for protection against all kind of evils as Othmar Keel and Christoph Uehlinger noted.[41] Noteworthy is the omission of the beard in many cases, which leaves just the feather crown and the somewhat grotesque face as a marker of identification for Bes.

We have seen that the most common Bes vases from the Southern Levant are not that common in Egypt. The missing bent arms and lion's nose, which is mostly a simple blot of clay, and the vase type do not constitute an independent tradition of production in the Southern Levant.

Reducing the depiction of Bes to a vase makes it harder to identify the dwarf god. The vases from the Southern Levant omit the bent arms and in most cases the beard is reduced to a few scratches in the clay or omitted entirely. The nose is still prominent, yet very simplistic. Nearly all examples in Egypt and the Southern Levant have pointed ears, which Stern interprets as horns.[42]

The basic elements though are given by the form of the vase itself which is indicating a head with feather crown. This form is commonly used in the Southern Levant as well as in Egypt, so that there is very little variety in the vessels from the two regions. Only now and then further elements appear as mentioned above. However, all these Bes vases are never as elaborate and rich in detail as

Fig. 2: Faience vase from Samos (Hölbl 2005).

[41] Keel 1992: 240.150.

[42] Stern 2001: 509. Very similar is reduction of Bes on Philisto-Arabian coins. The main elements are the beard, the ears and the feather crown. The nose is yet prominent but not distinctive; see Mildenberg 1995: Pl. I.

the beautiful Egyptian faience vase from the 6th century BCE (**Fig. 2**) found at the excavation at Samos.

5. Cultural Function

In order to determine the function of the Bes vases in the Southern Levant we need to take a closer look at the context where these objects have been found.

The specific archaeological context of Bes vases found in the Southern Levant as well as in Egypt cannot be determined.[43]

The vases from Deve Hüyük and Tel Haror were found in graves. Both objects have no or only very few damaged spots. It is very probable to assume that they were intentionally included in the burial.

The specimen from Tel Dor was shattered in an area of a Persian period store house. Since it was found scattered there is no way to explain its function from the context. Perhaps it was used as a charm or just a merchandise object. The mostly complete vase from Tel el-Ḥesi was found in a pit, which does not indicate a function. The same can be said about the vase from Tel Mevorakh.

Many of the vases from Egypt were also found in graves.[44]

Kaiser initiated a more thorough DNA and protein analysis of the inner side of 24 Bes vases to examine the content of the vases. Only four had results at all, testing positive for DNA of Bos Taurus (cattle). Just one object tested positive for protein residue.[45] This strongly suggest, that the vessels contained cow milk. Traces of milk of other animals were not found.

The element of milk and the context of graves fit into the personality of Bes. Bes is the protector of the pregnant mother and her child, but also the companion of the dead, sometimes cutting out the heart of the deceased, sometimes acting as their protector.[46] Both aspects allow a connection with milk, since it nourishes the newborn and brings back life to the dead.[47]

As master of the animals, as Bes is depicted in Phoenicia since the Iron Age II,[48] he is the protector from chaos, especially wild animals. This symbol is not specific. Wild animals as a danger or even a punishment of a god are often

[43] Kaiser 2003: 370–376.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Kaiser 2003: 364f. The origin of three objects is unknown, the fourth is from Saqqara and has not been published. Even with the test results there is no archaeological context to combine the objects with to determine its function or use.

[46] Wilson 1975: 80f.

[47] Guidotti 1983: 35.

[48] The dates differ slightly. Keel and Uehlinger mention a few examples from the beginning of the 10th century BCE and Wilson from the 7th or 6th century BCE. Both agree that most items date to a later time in this period. Wilson 1975: 88; Keel 1992: 250f.

associated with war or suppression and illness.[49] In these cases Bes is a general protector.[50]

The same is true for the vases from the Southern Levant. Their shape makes them a symbol for Bes and thus get an apotropaic function themselves: They were a charm protecting their owner. It is not evident whether they had any other meaning beyond that (e.g. influenced by Egypt).[51]

6. Historical Background

The archaeological context of the objects points to the 6th and 5th centuries BCE. We can assume that in this period there was trade between Egypt and the Southern Levant, often pushed by the Phoenicians.

The inclusion of Egypt in the Achaemenid Empire was never easy. Cambyses II was the first who conquered Egypt (525 BCE). In the following years different revolts started until (after the death of Darius I) Pharaoh Amyrtaios could regain Egypt's freedom (404 BCE) for the following 60 years.

In the time of the late 6th and 5th centuries BCE there was a close military relationship between the Persian army and Egypt. Possibly it was soldiers that bought objects like Bes vases and took them to the grave, as was the case in Deve Hüyük. A military context is also possible at Tell el-Ḥesi and Tell Jemmeh as mentioned above.

This historical connection does not explain the story of each and every vessel, but it opens a possible explanation of how the Bes vases ended up in the Southern Levant: as cargo of merchants and personal luggage of soldiers.

7. Final Remarks

Bes vases are objects in transition with pictures in transition. It is likely that they have been imported from Egypt in a time with not only intensive mercantile but also military contact with the Southern Levant. The form of the vases is iconographically self-explanatory. People could easily recognize Bes and expected him to be an apotropaic protector for the living and the dead.

[49] We can find a combination of those curses as a literary motive in some passages of the Old Testament (Lev 26:22, Jer 28:14, Ezek 14:21) and perhaps as a relict in Rev 6:8.

[50] A similar conclusion was reached by Defernez in her recent study (Defernez 2021: 54). Cf. also Gill 2020: 204 and Marchand 2020.

[51] In any case, it is not known whether they were filled with milk. Which symbolic meaning this would have had in the Southern Levant, however, is again another question.

The examples from the Southern Levant are mostly of high quality. They are made from fine clay and outline with the stern form of Bes and rather poor details. Only a few vessels depict the lion nose and none shows the bent arms. We may conclude that it is not the Egyptian tradition shown by the object, but a tradition specific to the Southern Levant.

Many archaeological objects from the Persian period in the Southern Levant show strong influences mainly from Greek and Achaemenid cultures.[52] The influence from Egypt is still there and also the local Iron Age tradition. This may explain why new forms and motifs existed in parallel to the old traditions. They were melted together and new designs were developed as in the case of the Bes vases.

CATALOGUE

Cat. No. 1: Tel Dor
(Stern and Sharon 1995: 31).



Cat. No. 2: Tel Haror
(Oren et al. 1991: 18).

[52] Stern 1982; Stern 2001.

Cat. No. 3: Tell el-Ḥesi
(Blakely and Horton 1986: 116).



Cat. No. 4: Deve Hüyük
(Woolley 1914–1916: 128).

Cat. No. 5: Tell Jemmeh
(Stern 1976a: Pl. 32C).

Cat. No. 6: Tell Jemmeh
(Stern 1976a: Pl. 33B).

Cat. No. 7: Tel Mevorakh
(Stern 1978: Pl. 43:4).

Cat. No. 8: Moshe Dayan Collection
(Stern 1976a: Pl. 32D).

Cat. No. 9: Warschaw Collection
(Stern 1976a: Pl. 33A).

References

Area D2 (02.06.2014), Online: http://dor.huji.ac.il/areaD2.html (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Aston, David A., and B. G. Aston, 2003, The Dating of Late Period Bes Vases, in: Carol A. Redmount and Cathleen A. Keller (eds.), *Egyptian Pottery. Proceedings of the 1990 Pottery Symposium at the University of California*, Berkeley, 95–113.

Bennett, W. J., and Jeffrey A. Blakely, 1989, *Tell el-Hesi. The Persian Period (Stratum V)*, Winona Lake, IN.

Blakely, Jeffrey A., and Fred L. Horton, 1986, South Palestinian Bes Vessels of the Persian Period: *Levant* 18, 111–119.

Defernez, Catherine, 2009, Les vases Bès à l'époque perse (Égypte-Levant), in: Pierre Briant and Michel Chauveau (eds.), *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménide*, Paris, 153–215.

Defernez, Catherine, 2010, Quatre vases Bès provenant de Tell el-Herr (Nord-Sinaï). Description analytique et corrélation avec l'orfèvrerie de tradition achéménide: *Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne* 3, 109–136.

Defernez, Catherine, 2021, L'image de Bès et la céramique égyptienne: *Égypte, Afrique & Orient* 100, 47–58.

Gill, James C.R., 2020, A Bes-vessel from Bahariya Oasis, Egypt, in: Ashten R. Warfe, James C. R. Gill, Caleb R. Hamilton, Amy J. Pettman, David A. Steward (eds.), *Dust, Demons and Pots: Studies in Honour of Colin A. Hope*, Leuven, 202–215.

Guidotti, M. Cristina, 1983, I potesi di significato e tipologia dei vasi egizi di Epoca Tarda raffiguranti il dio Bes: *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 6, 33–65.

Hölbl, Günther, 2005, Väschen in Gestalt des Bes, in: Herbert Beck, Peter C. Bol, and Maraike Bückling (eds.), *Ägypten, Griechenland und Rom. Abwehr und Berührung*, Tübingen, 64–65.

Kaiser, Kevin Robert, 2003, *Water, Milk, Beer and Wine for the Living and the Dead. Egyptian and Syro-Palestinian Bes-Vessels from the New Kingdom through the Graeco-Roman Period*, Ann Arbor.

Keel, Othmar, and Christoph Uehlinger, 1992, *Göttinnen, Götter und Gottessymbole. Neue Erkenntnisse zur Religionsgeschichte Kanaans und Israels aufgrund bislang unerschlossener ikonographischer Quellen*, Freiburg.

Kipfer, Sara, and Silvia Schroer, 2015, Der Körper als Gefäß. Studie zur visuellen Anthropologie des Alten Orients: http://www.lectio.unibe.ch/15_1/kipfer_schroer_der_koerper_als_gefaess.html (last accessed: 1 August 2024).

Kuchman Sabbahy, Lisa, 1982, Observations on Bes-pots of the Late Period: *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 109, 147–149.

Lecuyot, Guy, 2009, Quelques vases Bès sortis des sables de Saqqâra, in: Isabelle Régen and Frédéric Servajean (eds.), *Verba manent. Recueil d'études dédiées à Dimitri Meeks par ses collègues et amis*, Montpellier, 253–263.

Marchand, Sylvie, 2020, A Funny Bes Vase! Early Fourth Century BCE. Ayn Manâwir, Kharga Oasis, in: Ashten R. Warfe, James C. R. Gill, Caleb R. Hamilton, Amy J. Pettman, David A. Steward (eds.), *Dust, Demons and Pots: Studies in Honour of Colin A. Hope*, Leuven, 493–502.

Mildenberg, Leo, 1995, Bes on Philisto-Arabian Coins: *Transeuphratène* 9, 63–65.

Moorey, P. R. S., 1975, Iranian Troops at Deve Hüyük in Syria in the Earlier Fifth Century B.C.: *Levant* 7, 108–117.

Oren, Eliezer et al., 1991, Tel Haror. After Six Seasons: *Qadmoniot* 24, 2–19.

Ornan, Tallay, 1986, *A Man and His Land. Highlights from the Moshe Dayan Collection*, Jerusalem.

Petrie, W. M. Flinders, 1928, *Gerar*, London.

Razmjou, Sharokh, 2005, Religion and Burial Customs, in: John Curtis and Nigel Tallis (eds.), *The Forgotten Empire. The World of Ancient Persia*, London, 150–180.

Rees, Lea et al., 2024, An Egyptian Deity in Persian Period Judea? On a Locally-Made Bes Vessel from Jerusalem: *Eretz-Israel* 35, 118–127.

Reisner, George A., Clarence S. Fisher, and David G. Lyon, 1924, *Harvard Excavations at Samaria 1908–1910*, Cambridge, MA.

Schroer, Silvia, 2018, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient: eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern, Vol. 4: Die Eisenzeit bis zum Beginn der achämenidischen Herrschaft*, Basel.

Stern, Ephraim, 1976a, Bes Vases from Palestine and Syria: *Israel Exploration Journal* 26, 183–187.

Stern, Ephraim, 1976b, Phoenician Bes Vases from the Land of Israel: *Qadmoniot* 34–35, 69–71.

Stern, Ephraim, 1978, *Excavations at Tell Mevorakh (1973–1976). From the Iron Age to the Roman Period*, Tel Aviv.

Stern, Ephraim, 1982, *Material Culture of the Land of Israel of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period 538–332 B.C.*, Jerusalem.

Stern, Ephraim, 2001, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible. The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods (732–332 B.C.E.)*, New Haven.

Stern, Ephraim, 2010, Figurines and Cult Objects of the Iron Age and the Persian Period, in: id. (ed.), *Excavations at Dor. Figurines, Cult Objects and Amulets*, Jerusalem, 3–116.

Stern, Ephraim, 2015a, Iron Age I-II Phoenician Pottery, in: Seymour Gitin (ed.), *The Ancient Pottery of Israel and Its Neighbors. from the Iron Age through the Hellenistic Period*, Tel Aviv, 435–582.

Stern, Ephraim, 2015b, Persian Period, in: Seymour Gitin (ed.), *The Ancient Pottery of Israel and Its Neighbors from the Iron Age through the Hellenistic Period*, Tel Aviv, 565–617.

Stern, Ephraim and Ilan Sharon, 1995, Tel Dor, 1993. Preliminary Report: *Israel Exploration Journal* 45, 26–36.

Vaelske, Veit, 2022, Coroplastic Figural Art in Egypt during the Late Period (664–332 BC), in: Erin D. Darby and Izaak J. de Hulster (eds.), *Iron Age Terracotta Figurines from the Southern Levant in Context*, Leiden, 375–424.

Velde, Herman te, 1999, Bes, in: Karel van der Toorn (ed.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden, 330–331.

Wilson, Veronica, 1975, The Iconography of Bes with Particular Reference to The Cypriot Evidence: *Levant* 7, 77–103.

Woolley, Charles L., 1914, A North Syrian Cemetery of the Persian Period: *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 6, 87–89.

Woolley, Charles L. 1914–1916, A North Syrian Cemetery of the Persian Period: *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 7, 115–129.

Yarmolovich, Victoria I., 2015, Dating the Bes Vessels from the CES RAS Excavations at Kom Tuman, in: Sergei V. Ivanov and Elena G. Tolmacheva (eds.), *And the Earth is Joyous... Studies in Honour of Galina A. Belova*, Moscow, 389–397.

GÖTTER IN DER FREMDE – ÜBERLEGUNGEN ZU GRIECHISCHEN MOTIVEN IM HELLENISTISCHEN BILDREPERTOIRE DES ANTIKEN ORIENTS

Philipp Frei

With the conquest of the Achaemenid Empire by Alexander the Great, a process of Hellenization in the ancient Near East began. As a result, Greek deities and the values represented by them gained in importance and connected with the traditions of the ancient Near East. The result is, among other things, an imagery that, while reminiscent of what is given from the motherland of the Greeks, still incorporates in some aspects the pictorial traditions of the ancient Near East. This small study reflects on images of the Greek goddess Aphrodite: Do motif and/or statement correspond to Greek or ancient Near Eastern traditions? Are there any new creations? These and further questions shall be clarified by way of example.

1. Einleitende Überlegungen

Alexander dem Großen war das scheinbar Unmögliche gelungen, indem er das große Reich der achämenidischen Perser endgültig in die Knie gezwungen hatte. Zum allerersten Mal in der Geschichte des Vorderen Orients standen die altorientalischen Kulturen unter der Fremdherrschaft eines griechischen Königreiches. Bereits während seines Feldzuges hatte Alexander damit begonnen, die von ihm durchreisten Regionen zu prägen, indem auf der gesamten Reisestrecke griechische Neugründungen von ihm vorgenommen wurden (bspw. *Alexandreia ad Aegyptum*, *Alexandreia ad Issum*, *Alexandreia ad Caucasum*). Damit hob er den Prozess der Hellenisierung des Ostens auf ein neues und bislang unerreichtes Niveau. Freilich hatten schon in der Vergangenheit griechische Wertvorstellungen, Götter sowie Handwerkskunst die Gestade des Alten Orients erreicht und Einfluss auf die altorientalischen Kulturen ausgeübt, gerade zur Zeit der persischen Herrschaft. Doch integrierten die Achämeniden eine Vielzahl an verschiedensten Einflüssen, bspw. auch jene der Assyrer und Ägypter, in ihre eigene Kultur. Unter Alexander dem Großen aber gelangten griechische Vorstellungen bis in die entferntesten Ecken der damals bekannten Welt, während seine Nachfolger, die Diadochen, dafür Sorge trugen, dass unter ihrer teils lang andauernden Herrschaft das Griechische Eingang in die regionalen Kulturen fand.

Daher verwundert es nicht, in der Bildwelt bzw. in allen relevanten Lebensbereichen des hellenistisch geprägten Orients eine Vielzahl bekannter Gesichter wiederzuentdecken: Griechische Gottheiten wie die Liebesgöttin Aphrodite, ihr treuer Begleiter Eros, der Bogenschütze Apollon oder auch die Städtepatronin Tyche waren populär und wurden in verschiedenster Art und Weise reproduziert, sei dies als überlebensgroße Marmorstatue, kleinformatige Terrakottafigurine oder aber als Darstellung auf Münzen und Siegeln. Doch auch wenn die Reproduktion dieser griechischen Gottheiten im Osten offensichtlich ist, stellt sich bildanalytisch eine Vielzahl interessanter Fragen: Korrespondieren das Motiv und das Thema mit den Traditionen des antiken Griechenlands oder mit denen des Alten Orients? Oder handelt es sich gar um Neuschöpfungen, die eigens für die griechischen Götter in den fremden Gefilden geschaffen worden sind? Welche Lebensbereiche bzw. Wertvorstellungen werden durch diese göttlichen Gestalten überhaupt repräsentiert?

Ein Beispiel aus dem ptolemäischen Ägypten mag die Berechtigung dieser Fragen veranschaulichen: Es handelt sich dabei um eine aus dem Fajjum stammende, hellenistisch zu datierende Tonfigurine der genuin griechischen Göttin Nemesis, die heute in Hildesheim aufbewahrt wird.[1] Zu sehen ist eine frontal dem Betrachter zugewandte, stehende Frau mit jugendlichen Gesichtszügen, die in knöchellange Gewänder gekleidet ist und ihr Haupt bedeckt hält. Während der rechte Arm und ein allfälliges Objekt in der rechten Hand nicht erhalten sind, umfasst sie mit der linken Armbeuge sowie mit der linken Hand eine lange Fackel. Zugleich ruht ihr linker Fuß auf einem Rad mit sechs Speichen, indes der rechte Fuß auf festem Grund steht. Neben dem Rad, ausgestreckt auf dem Boden liegend, lässt sich zudem eine weitere weibliche Gestalt mit langem Haar ausmachen. Bei der Niedergeworfenen muss es sich – dem Prinzip polar entgegengesetzter, aber dennoch miteinander verbundener Kräfte entsprechend – um den Gegenpart zu Nemesis handeln: Hybris. In ihrer Bedeutung vermittelt die Gruppe somit eine symbolhafte, aber verständliche Botschaft: Die personifizierte Hybris im Sinne eines intendiert ehrverletzenden, somit gesellschaftlich untragbaren Verhaltens gegenüber einer Person, mit dem Ziel, sich dieser überlegen zu fühlen, wird stets besiegt von der strafenden Vergeltung, der Nemesis. Denn das Glück eines jeden ist unbeständig und wechselhaft, weshalb niemand seiner gerechten Strafe auf Dauer entgehen kann, wie dies durch das Rad mit den sechs Speichen symbolisiert wird.[2] Sowohl die übergeordnete Botschaft wie auch die involvierten Personifikationen repräsentieren griechisches Gedankengut, wie es bereits bei Homer im Konflikt zwischen Agamemnon und Achilles vorzufinden

[1] Hildesheim, Roemer- und Pelizaeus-Museum, Inventar-No. 434. Vgl. u.a. Beck et al. 2005: 582f Katalog-No. 155.

[2] Fisher 1992: 151.174.178; LIMC Nemesis S. 735; Caterina Maderna, in: Beck et al. 2005: 582f Katalog-No. 155.

ist (Hom. Il. 1,171.244.355–356.412.506–510). Es wäre nun anzunehmen, dass diese Figurengruppe, welche stilistisch sicher als griechisch-hellenistisch zu beschreiben ist, auch in der motivischen Umsetzung der griechischen Kultur zuzuordnen sei. Aus dem älteren Bildrepertoire zur Göttin Nemesis ist (bislang) jedoch kein Vergleichsstück bekannt.[3] Handelt es sich also um eine motivische Neuschöpfung aus der Zeit des Hellenismus? Dies trifft sicherlich für das Bildrepertoire der Nemesis zu, aber motivisch reiht sich die Gruppe in eine Jahrtausende alte Bildtradition Ägyptens ein: Es handelt sich um die weit verbreitete Darstellung einer Figur (Pharao oder Gottheit), die einen Feind vernichtet bzw. unterwirft.[4] Dabei kommt die Verschmelzung dieser griechischen Divinität mit der durch die ägyptische Bildtradition etablierten Vorstellung nicht von ungefähr: „Die allumfassende Macht, mit der sie (Nemesis) über ihre Gegner triumphierte, spiegelte sich in der göttlichen Omnipotenz der ägyptischen Pharaonen wie in den entsprechenden Eigenschaften der Ptolemäerherrscher auf analoge Weise."[5]

Die ptolemäerzeitliche Figurengruppe von Nemesis und Hybris belegt somit nachdrücklich, dass die hellenistische Kunst und ihre Bildwelt auch stets im Hinblick auf ihre regionalen Bezüge betrachtet werden müssen. Dies gilt freilich auch für hellenistische Zeugnisse der Bildkunst, die aus dem Herrschaftsgebiet der Seleukiden stammen. Hier gestaltet sich die Ausgangslage jedoch vergleichsweise schwieriger. So ist auch im populären Standardwerk zum Grundwissen der Klassischen Archäologie von Tonio Hölscher noch immer zu lesen: „Antiochia und der seleukidische Raum ist künstlerisch eine fast unbekannte Größe."[6] Diese Forschungslücke hängt mit vielerlei Faktoren zusammen: Zunächst sind natürlich die vielerorts instabilen politischen Umstände im modernen Vorderen Orient zu nennen, die neuere Forschungen zumeist unmöglich machen, sodass die Forschenden auf ältere, zumeist unvollständige Grabungspublikationen oder, wenn diese vollständig fehlen, auf mehr oder minder detaillierte Vorberichte, ebenfalls älteren Datums, angewiesen sind. Ein nicht unwesentliches Problem stellen die modern gesetzten Fächergrenzen dar, weshalb der hellenistische Orient von der archäologischen Forschung oft stiefmütterlich behandelt wird. So ist der Hellenismus im Orient chronologisch zu jung für die Disziplin der Vorderasiatischen Archäologie, während er für den Fachbereich der Klassischen Archäologie geographisch zu weit östlich liegt. Außerdem fehlt

[3] Vgl. den Kommentar in LIMC Nemesis S. 755–757. Nach LIMC Nemesis S. 758f tritt das hier als ‚Erinyentypus' bezeichnete Bildmotiv in der römischen Kaiserzeit erstmals in Erscheinung. Die Hildesheimer Figurine scheint somit ein bislang singulärer Vertreter des Bildmotivs im älteren Hellenismus zu sein.

[4] Caterina Maderna, in: Beck et al. 2005: 583 Katalog-No. 155.

[5] Ebd.

[6] Hölscher ^{4}2015: 221.

noch immer eine verlässliche relative Chronologie zur hellenistischen Kunst im Allgemeinen, weshalb die zwar gut ausformulierten, aber längst nicht mehr auf der Höhe der Zeit stehenden Ausführungen von Gerhard Kramer[7] für eine stilistische Datierung des Materials herangezogen werden müssen.[8] Des Weiteren spielt der Erhaltungszustand der Objekte eine zentrale Rolle, da er häufig eine genauere Analyse der Darstellung auf dem jeweiligen Medium aufgrund von externen Einflüssen (Erosion, moderne Zerstörung etc.) verhindert. Umso mehr sollte Material, welches interpretiert werden kann – wie bspw. die in ihrer Fundanzahl stetig anwachsende Siegelkunst aus dem Herrschaftsgebiet der Seleukiden[9] – unsere Beachtung finden. Im Rahmen der hier präsentierten Studie werden daher anhand ausgewählter Fallbeispiele allgemeine Beobachtungen und weiterführende Überlegungen zur Ikonographie im Reich der Seleukiden zusammengefasst, wobei exemplarisch die griechische Göttin Aphrodite in den Blick genommen werden soll.[10] Denn zu dieser im hellenistischen Orient populären Figur des griechischen Kulturkreises liegt eine einigermaßen aussagekräftige Materialmenge vor.

2. Aphrodite – eine griechische Göttin in neuer Gestalt

Zur Zeit des Hellenismus existieren von Aphrodite Reproduktionen für alle relevanten Bildträger der antiken Kunst, ob groß- oder kleinformatig. Überlebensgroße Marmorplastik wurde ebenso entdeckt wie Figurinen aus Terrakotta, metallene Statuetten oder Siegel bzw. Siegelungen.[11] Populär scheinen Darstellungen der Aphrodite gewesen zu sein, die die Göttin nackt oder leicht bekleidet

[7] Kramer 1923/24.

[8] Vgl. zur Forschungssituation der hellenistischen Zeit auch Hölscher [4]2015: 221f.

[9] Diese zählt bei allein vier gefundenen Archiven auf dem Herrschaftsgebiet der Seleukiden (Uruk, Seleukia am Tigris, Tel Kedesch und Zeugma) bereits heute angeblich über 150'000 Exemplare (!), Tendenz steigend (wie bspw. die neuen Siegelfunde aus Maresha zeigen, s. Stern/Ariel 2020).

[10] Mein Vortrag an der Konferenz enthielt auch Ausführungen zu den griechischen Göttern Eros und Tyche. Für den vorliegenden Beitrag konzentriere ich mich auf die Göttin Aphrodite.

[11] Hierbei ist zu beachten, dass die verschiedenen Bildmedien in ganz unterschiedlicher Quantität vorliegen. So ist etwa das gefundene Material zu Aphrodite im Bereich der Glyptik ungleich grösser als jenes im Bereich der Terrakotta-Figurinen, wie Adi Erlich in der anschließenden Diskussion zum Vortrag des Autors dankenswerterweise angemerkt hat. Auch variiert die Materialmenge zu den einzelnen Gottheiten an unterschiedlichen Orten teils stark. Als Beispiel sei hier die Glyptik genannt: Während im Archiv von Tel Kedesch Aphrodite eine der populärsten Gottheiten im Hinblick auf die bezeugten Siegeldarstellungen ist, muss die Materialmenge zu Aphrodite im Archiv von Seleukia am Tigris, der Hauptresidenz der Seleukiden, als eher gering im Kontext des gesamten Archives eingestuft werden. Vgl. hierzu Çakmak 2011: 67. Aufschlussreich ist auch die Graphik bei Herbert 2004/05: 70, Fig. 4f.

zeigen. Diese noch in klassischer Zeit unübliche Darstellungsweise der Göttin gewann zur Zeit des Hellenismus an Relevanz. Den Anfang machte hierbei die berühmte Aphrodite von Knidos, welche der Bildhauer Praxiteles ca. 340 v.u.Z. im Auftrag für die Stadt Kos erschaffen haben soll.[12] Die Plastik zeigt die Göttin in einem sehr privatem Moment: Gerade dem Bade entstiegen, steht sie vollkommen nackt vor dem Betrachter, wobei sie mit einer Hand ihre Scham bedeckt, während sie mit der anderen nach einem Handtuch greift, welches auf einer direkt daneben stehenden Hydria liegt. Nach Plinius (Plin. nat. 36,20f) waren die Einwohner von Kos von dem ungewohnt freizügigen Anblick der Göttin nicht sehr angetan, weshalb die Stadt Knidos das Werk für sich selbst erwarb. In der nachfolgenden Zeit wurde das dem privaten Lebensbereich zuzuordnende Bildthema der nackten und dem Bad entstiegenen Aphrodite immer beliebter. Dieser Umstand lässt sich auch im Material des hellenistischen Orients nachverfolgen.

3. Die Göttin in der Fremde

Den Anfang meiner Beobachtungen bildet eine tönerne Figurine aus Tarsus (Kilikien), deren heutiger Aufbewahrungsort unbekannt zu sein scheint.[13] Sie reproduziert das berühmte Bildnis der Knidischen Aphrodite im Vergleich mit der *Venus Colonna*[14] äußerst detailgetreu. Unterschiede finden sich in der Ausrichtung des Oberkörpers, welcher sich bei der Terrakotte nach links neigt, sowie in der daraus resultierenden Neigung des Kopfes, die nach rechts tendiert. Dadurch ist auch die Ausrichtung des Gesichtes eine andere als bei der vatikanischen Großplastik. Ansonsten unterscheiden sich die Kopien nur in Details: Die Hydria der Terrakotte steht auf keinem Sockel, das Handtuch scheint kürzer zu sein und wird in anderer Art und Weise von Aphrodite gegriffen. Zudem fehlt ein Armreif, welcher bei der *Venus Colonna* vorhanden ist. Die kilikische Terrakotte ist somit eine detailgetreue und dem Original zeitlich näherstehende Nachbildung – ein erstes Indiz dafür, dass auch im hellenistischen Osten durchaus Interesse an den genuin griechischen und zur Zeit des Hellenismus gängigen Bildmotiven und -themen vorhanden war.

[12] LIMC Aphrodite S. 49; Herbert 2004/05: 72; Smith 2014: 79f. Das originale Bildnis von Praxiteles ist nicht erhalten geblieben, jedoch eine Vielzahl an römischen Kopien. Eine der am besterhaltenen und wohl detailgetreuesten Kopien der Knidischen Aphrodite ist die sogenannte *Venus Colonna*, welche heute in den *Musei Vaticani* (Inventar-No. 812) zu sehen ist. Vgl. hierzu LIMC Aphrodite 391; Havelock 1995: Fig. 18; Smith 2014: 92, Fig. 98,1–2.

[13] LIMC Aphrodite 403; Keel/Schroer 2004: 226, Fig. 210b.

[14] LIMC Aphrodite 391; Smith 2014: 92, Fig. 98,1–2.

Weitere, sehr interessante Figurinen aus Ton stammen aus dem hellenistischen Babylon.[15] Sie alle zeigen in etwa dasselbe Bildmotiv: Eine nackte, kauernde Frau scheint sich nach dem Bade mit einem Handtuch abzutrocknen, während sie sich mit ihrer linken Hand auf ein (Schmuck-)Kästchen stützt. Direkt neben ihr steht – nebst einer Schüssel – zumeist ein kleiner Junge mit Flügeln. Letzterer ist als Eros, Gott der Liebe, zu identifizieren, weshalb es sich bei der Kauernden um seine Mutter Aphrodite handeln dürfte. Auch wenn die Figurinen bezüglich der Haltung, gerade des Oberkörpers, eine abweichende Realisierung aufweisen, so berufen sie sich doch auf eine oft rezipierte griechische Großplastik: die beim Bade kauernde Aphrodite des Bildhauers Doidalsas von Bythnien, vermutlich um die Mitte des 3. Jahrhunderts v.u.Z. geschaffen.[16] Erneut kann somit ein Interesse am hellenistischen Bildthema des privaten Bades sowie an der nackten Gottheit konstatiert werden.

Im hellenistischen Osten besser belegt ist jedoch ein anderes Bildmotiv der griechischen Liebesgöttin, welches ebenfalls dem Thema des privaten Bades zugehörig ist: das Motiv der Aphrodite Anadyomene.[17] Das originale Werk war in diesem Falle keine Statue, sondern ein Gemälde, welches von Apelles, dem persönlichen Maler von Alexander dem Großen, für das Asklepieion von Kos geschaffen wurde, wie dies spätere römische Schriftquellen berichten (Plin. nat. 35,91, Strab. Geographica 14,2,19). Dabei gehen die antiken Quellen zumeist kaum auf die Pose der Aphrodite von Apelles ein.[18] Allein der Epigrammatiker Antipatros von Sidon, welcher um 125 v.u.Z. gestorben ist, definiert die Darstellung ein wenig genauer. So schreibt er in einem seiner Epigramme (Anthologia Graeca 16,178):[19]

τὰν ἀναδυομέναν ἀπὸ ματέρος ἄρτι θαλάσσας
Κύπριν, Ἀπελλείου μόχθον ὅρα γραφίδος,
ὡς χερὶ συμμάρψασα διάβροχον ὕδατι χαίταν
ἐκθλίβει νοτερῶν ἀφρὸν ἀπὸ πλοκάμων.

[15] Vgl. Karvonen-Kannas 1995: 143 Nos. 191–194; Pl. 34f Nos. 191–194.

[16] LIMC Aphrodite S. 104; Havelock 1995: 80–83; Smith 2014: 80. Für die das nicht erhaltene Original am getreusten wiedergebende römische Kopie, vgl. Lullies 1954: Abb. 7; LIMC Aphrodite 1018; Havelock 1995: Fig. 23; Andreae 2001: Fig. 32. Eros als Begleitfigur ist auch bei späteren römischen Reproduktionen des Bildmotives anzutreffen. *Exempli gratia* für Eros als Begleitfigur der kauernden Aphrodite: Lullies 1954: Abb. 9 und 15; LIMC Aphrodite 1019.1020.1022.

[17] Altgriechisch: Ἀναδυομένη (transkribiert: *Anadyoméne*), zu Deutsch: ‚Die Auftauchende'.

[18] LIMC Aphrodite S. 54; Havelock 1995: 86f; Çakmak 2011: 68.

[19] „Eine Kythere, wie eben dem Schoss sie des Meeres entstiegen, kannst du hier sehen, ein Werk, das uns Apelles gemalt. Schau, sie fasst mit der Hand nach den Locken, noch feucht von den Wassern, und aus dem tropfenden Haar ringt sie sich drückend den Schaum." Originaltext und deutsche Übersetzung aus Beckby ^{2}1965: 398f No. 178. Vgl. hierzu auch Havelock 1995: 86f; Çakmak 2011: 68 Anm. 13.

Apelles hat somit einen Moment für sein Gemälde gewählt, welcher mit der ersten Erscheinung der Göttin in Verbindung steht: der Geburt der Göttin. Dieser geht die Kastration von Uranos durch seinen Sohn Kronos voraus, wie dies bei Hesiod (Hes. theog. 176–202) nachzulesen ist. Das abgehackte Glied fiel dabei ins Meer und aus dem Gemisch von Blut, Samen und Salzwasser entstand die Göttin der Liebe. Auch wenn es nicht zweifelsfrei konstatiert werden kann, so scheint auf dem Gemälde des Apelles die soeben geborene Aphrodite dargestellt gewesen zu sein, wie sie den Wellen, die an die Gestade Zyperns brandeten, entstieg und sich dabei das Wasser aus den langen Haaren wrang.

Unabhängig davon, ob Apelles wirklich der Schöpfer des Anadyomene-Motivs war oder nicht, ist das Bildmotiv einer nackten oder nur leicht bekleideten Frau,[20] welche in leichtem Kontrapost stehend ihre Haare in zwei Strähnen trennt, um sie mit beiden Händen auszuwringen, in der gesamten hellenistischen Kunst vergleichsweise gut und für die verschiedensten Bildträger – diese zumeist der Kleinkunst zugehörig – belegt.[21] Anders als bei den bereits besprochenen Terrakotten zur Knidischen bzw. zur kauernden Aphrodite lässt diese Materialmenge es zu, einen genaueren Blick auf die östliche Umsetzung des ursprünglich griechischen Motivs zu werfen.

Als erstes ist das Augenmerk auf eine Tonfigurine aus dem südlevantinischen Marescha zu werfen (**Abb. 1**).[22] Die Figurine ist zwar nur zur Hälfte erhalten. Doch glücklicherweise fehlt der Unterkörper und nicht der für die Identifizierung als Aphrodite Anadyomene wichtige Oberkörper. Die Figurine gibt das Bildmotiv getreu den großplastischen Kopien der römischen Zeit in naturalistischer Art und Weise wieder: Die nackte Göttin greift mit ihren Händen in die in zwei Strähnen aufgetrennten Haare und dreht sie, um so das Wasser auszuwringen. Dies führt zu einer Armhaltung, bei welcher die rechte Armbeuge höher situiert ist als die linke. Zugleich wendet Aphrodite ihren Kopf leicht nach rechts, wodurch der frontal auf die Göttin blickende Betrachter keinen Blickkontakt zu ihr aufnehmen kann. Es kann deshalb von einer getreuen Wiedergabe des griechischen Bildmotivs – zumindest im Hinblick auf die gebräuchlichste Darstellungsweise innerhalb des erhaltenen Materials zur Aphrodite Anadyomene – gesprochen werden.

[20] Weiterführend zur plastischen Verwirklichung des Themas, vgl. LIMC Aphrodite S. 55. Ebenfalls zu den zwei verschiedenen Traditionen (nackt vs. halb bekleidet), vgl. Havelock 1995: 88–92; Çakmak 2011: 69 inkl. Anm. 20.

[21] LIMC Aphrodite S. 54; Havelock 1995: 86f; Erlich/Kloner 2008: 11; Çakmak 2011: 70. *Exempli gratia* für (spät-)hellenistische Reproduktionen des Motivs: LIMC Aphrodite 428–437; LIMC Aphrodite (in peripheria orientali) 40.42.45; Beck et al. 2005: 626f Katalog-No. 209. Ausführlich zur Belegsituation im Osten, vgl. Çakmak 2011: 68–72.

[22] Erlich/Kloner 2006: Pl. 5:16

Abb. 1: Figurine einer Aphrodite Anadyomene aus Marescha
(Erlich/Kloner 2006: Pl. 5:16).

Dass dies nicht immer der Fall ist, belegen einige andere Beispiele aus der Levante, wie dies Lisa A. Çakmak aufgezeigt hat.[23] Sie hat einen der aktuellsten zusammenfassenden Artikel zur Ausgangssituation bezüglich des Anadyomene-Motivs im hellenistischen Osten verfasst. Im Zentrum ihrer Ausführungen stehen dabei die insgesamt dreizehn Siegelabdrücke aus dem Archiv von Tel Kedesch,[24] welche eine Aphrodite des Typus Anadyomene zeigen und erstmals von Sharon C. Herbert[25] im Kontext des gesamten Archivfundes besprochen worden waren (**Abb. 2**). Da jede der Siegelungen auf einen eigenen Ring zurückzuführen ist, bot sich hier die seltene Möglichkeit an, dreizehn regionale Realisierungen des Anadyomene-Motivs miteinander zu vergleichen und im überregionalen Kontext zu situieren. Çakmak fasst die Ergebnisse ihrer Untersuchung folgendermaßen zusammen:

> „With the exception of KA 11, the Kedesh Anadyomene types are characterized by an almost complete absence of torsion through the torso, a jarring frontality, a gaze that has been described by Herbert as ‚an almost frightening apotropaic stare', a consistent absence of anatomical detail, and a level of disproportion between the upper and lower bodies."[26]

Diese abweichende Realisierung des Anadyomene-Motivs, die – anders als es in der großformatigen Kunst oder auch bei der Terrakotte von Marescha der Fall ist – nicht versucht, eine realistische Darstellung des menschlichen Körpers wiederzugeben, lässt im ersten Moment den voreiligen Schluss zu, dass dies auf

[23] Çakmak 2011.
[24] Vgl. Herbert 2004/05: 74, Fig. 7, Aph 4–9; Çakmak 2011: 73–75, Fig. 8–17.
[25] Herbert 2004/05.
[26] Çakmak 2011: 75. Vgl. hierzu auch die sehr ähnlichen Ausführungen von Herbert (2004/05: 75).

Abb. 2: Aphrodite Anadyomene auf einem Siegel von Tel Kedesch (Herbert 2023: 441, APHR 29).

fehlende handwerkliche Fertigkeit zurückzuführen sei. Wie Herbert und Çakmak aber treffend feststellt haben, kann dies nicht der hauptsächliche Grund sein, da viele andere Siegelabdrücke auf den *bullae* des fundreichen Archivs von Tel Kedesch von äußerst qualitätsvoll gearbeiteten Siegeln stammen und die Besitzer der Siegel somit durchaus Zugang zu handwerklichen Meistern der Siegelherstellung hatten.[27] Zudem lässt sich die als schlaksig zu bezeichnende Haltung der Aphrodite Anadyomene auf den Siegel von Tel Kedesch auch bei Siegelungen aus dem Archiv von Seleukia am Tigris, der Hauptresidenz der Seleukiden, nachweisen, wie dies Ariela Bollati[28] getan hat. Sie sieht die von ihr als ‚*dinoccolate*' bezeichnete Pose als Resultat kultureller Synthese an, bei welcher die genuin griechische Haltung chiastischer Art im künstlerischen Milieu des achämendischen Reiches umgewandelt worden sei.[29] In diesem Falle wäre das griechische Anadyomene-Motiv in seiner Haltung einer lokalen Gebräuchlichkeit angepasst worden. Doch damit nicht genug: Wie sowohl Herbert wie auch Çakmak treffend beobachtet haben, ist das Gesicht der Aphrodite Anadyomene auf den Siegeln von Tel Kedesch vollkommen frontal auf den Betrachter ausgerichtet. Dies ist eine weitere Abweichung von der großplastischen Realisierung der Aphrodite Anadyomene, bei denen der Kopf der Göttin geringfügig nach unten gerichtet sowie meist leicht nach rechts oder links geneigt ist, wodurch der Betrachter nicht in das private Geschehen involviert wird.[30] Vielmehr

[27] Herbert 2004/05: 75; Çakmak 2011: 76.
[28] Bollati 2003. Vgl. hierzu auch Çakmak 2011: 76 Anm. 48.
[29] Bollati 2003: 133.
[30] Herbert 2004/05: 75; Çakmak 2011: 75. Als Beispiel für die Blickausrichtung bei großplastischen Realisierungen, vgl. u.a. LIMC Aphrodite 424; Çakmak 2011: 70, Fig. 5.

erinnert der „almost frightening apotropaic stare“[31] an ältere oder auch zeitgleiche Darstellungen der Gorgo Medusa, ohne aber deren Schrecklichkeit zu erreichen.[32] Welche Absicht verfolgte der Siegelschneider damit? Denkbar wäre, dass er das Hauptmerkmal des Anadyomene-Motivs, nämlich das Auswringen der Haare auch auf dem kleinformatigen Bildträger gut sichtbar machen wollte und deshalb auf die unübliche frontale Ausrichtung des Gesichtes zurückgegriffen hat. Ein solches Vorgehen ist in römischer Zeit durchaus belegt.[33] Doch scheint eine andere Intention hinter der eigentümlichen Wahl zu stecken. So ist die perückenartige Ausgestaltung der Haare Aphrodites auf den Siegeln von Tel Kedesch äußerst auffällig. Nach Herbert und Çakmak lassen sich gerade die Haare mit lokalen Darstellungen von Isis und Astarte vergleichen und daher in die lokale phönizische Bildtradition einbinden.[34] Çakmak geht sogar noch weiter und vergleicht die frontale Ausrichtung des Gesichtes sowie die relativ schematische Erscheinung Aphrodites auf den Siegeln von Tel Kedesch mit den stark schematischen Darstellungen der Göttin Tanit.[35] Dass diese Vergleiche durchaus berechtigt sind und auch in der bildlichen Koine des multi-ethnischen bzw. multi-religiösen Orients zur Zeit des Hellenismus Sinn ergeben, soll nachfolgend durch ein außergewöhnliches Stück bekräftigt werden.

4. Eine hybride Aphrodite?

Die Rede ist von einer ehemals bemalten Reliefstele aus Kalkstein unbekannter Provenienz, heute im *Museo Egizio* in Turin (**Abb. 3**).[36] Darauf dargestellt ist ein Naos. Dessen Dachgebälk, welches eine Reihe von frontal dargestellten Uräen mit Sonnenscheiben zeigt, wird von zwei Säulen mit Papyrusdoldenkapitellen gestützt. Direkt neben diesen schlanken und nicht kannelierten Säulen steht zu beiden Seiten je ein Pfeiler, auf dem jeweils ein einzelnes liegendes Tier

[31] Herbert 2004/05: 75.

[32] Vgl. LIMC Gorgo, Gorgones 107–121a.

[33] Bspw. zur Generalisierung bei der Darstellung von Bauten, vgl. Küthmann et al. 1973: 7.

[34] Herbert 2004/05: 75; Çakmak 2011: 77f. Vgl. hierzu auch die bildliche Parallele bei Çakmak 2011: 78, Fig. 19.

[35] Çakmak 2011: 78f. Vgl. für eine beispielhafte Darstellung der Tanit u. a. Çakmak 2011: 79, Fig. 20.

[36] Turin, *Museo Egizio*, Inventar-No. 20500 (Cat. 1668). Höhe 34 cm; Breite 28 cm. Vgl. LIMC Isis 259; Arslan 1997: 66 No. II.37. Die hellenistische Datierung des Reliefs bei Arslan (1997: 66 No. II.37) wird durch eine römische Datierung (30 v.u.Z. bis 395 u.Z.) in der Online-Datenbank des *Museo Egizio* kontrastiert, vgl. https://collezioni.museoegizio.it/it-IT/material/Cat_1668/?description=&inventoryNumber=1668&title=&cgt=&yearFrom=&yearTo=&materials=&provenance=&acquisition=&epoch=&dynasty=&pharaoh= (letzter Zugriff am 1. Juni 2024).

Abb. 3: Isis-Aphrodite Anadyomene auf einer bemalten Reliefstele aus Kalkstein (Turin, Ägyptisches Museum, Cat. 1668).

auszumachen ist. Eine genauere Identifizierung der Wesen ist aufgrund des Erhaltungszustandes nicht möglich, aber es dürfte sich um Löwen handeln. Zwischen diesen Pfeilern ist die zentrale Figur dargestellt: Auf zwei Krokodilen – eines nach links, das andere nach rechts ausgerichtet – kauert eine vollkommen nackte, weibliche Gestalt. Während der Unterkörper mit dem voluminösen Bauch im Seitenprofil wiedergegeben ist, präsentieren sich der Oberkörper – mit kaum erkennbaren Brüsten – sowie das Gesicht frontal dem Betrachter. Letzteres weist mandelförmige Augen, eine relativ breit gestaltete Nase sowie volle Lippen auf und wird von einer perückenartigen, in zwei Strähnen geteilten Frisur gerahmt. Dabei umgreift die Frau mit der linken Hand ihre linke Haarsträhne, während sie sich mit der rechten Hand an ihre Kopfbedeckung fasst. Ihr Kopfschmuck besteht aus einem Kuhgehörn, einer zwischen den Hörnern liegenden Sonnenscheibe sowie zwei aufgerichteten Maat-Federn. Direkt über der Frau und ihrer Bekrönung, am Gebälk angebracht, ist darüber hinaus eine Sonnenscheibe mit zwei herabhängenden Uräen zu sehen.

Sogleich ist nicht nur die komplexe Ikonographie, sondern auch die Vermischung verschiedener Bildmotive bzw. -traditionen ersichtlich: So hat das Stehen der Götter auf Tieren in Ägypten, in der Levante sowie allgemein im Alten

Orient eine lange Tradition.[37] Dabei erinnert das frontal wiedergegebene Stehen auf zwei Krokodilen frappant an zeitgleiche Stelen bzw. *cippi* des Harpokrates.[38] Von zentraler Bedeutung ist aber die weibliche Figur selbst: Die kauernde Haltung der vollends entblößten Frau – gerade in der Wiedergabe der scherenartig auseinander strebenden Beine – entspricht dem Motiv der bereits erwähnten badenden Aphrodite des Doidalsas von Bythnien, auch wenn die Realisierung beim Turiner Relief eher einem Knien gleicht. Ebenfalls ist die füllige, von Speckfalten gezeichnete Bauchgegend dem griechischen Vorbilde vergleichbar nachgebildet worden, auch wenn der Bauch – wohl absichtlich – sehr voluminös geraten ist. Für den Oberkörper hingegen wurde das Motiv einer weiteren Aphrodite herangezogen: der bereits ausführlich besprochenen Anadyomene. Dies kann vor allem im Fassen der linken Haarsträhne nachvollzogen werden, während die rechte Seite in ein Greifen nach dem Kopfschmuck umgewandelt worden ist. Die auf den ersten Blick vielleicht ungewöhnliche Verschmelzung der beiden Bildmotive zu Aphrodite ist dabei kein Einzelfall, sondern in weiteren Beispielen belegt.[39] Am getreusten wird die bildmotivische Fusion bei einer wohl um 100 v.u.Z. geschaffenen Marmorstatuette von der Insel Rhodos wiedergegeben.[40] Während der Unterkörper auch hier der kauernden Aphrodite in sehr exakter Weise nachempfunden ist, spiegelt der Oberkörper zweifelsfrei das Anadyomene-Motiv des Auswringens der Haare wider. Ein weiteres schönes Beispiel dieses Zusammenschlusses der beiden genuin griechischen Bildmotive ist eine goldene Nadelfigur des späten 2. Jahrhunderts v.u.Z., bei welcher die fusionierte Aphrodite überdies von Eroten begleitet wird.[41] Dabei wird in der Forschung davon ausgegangen, dass diese Kombination der Bildmotive zu Aphrodite eine Schöpfung alexandrinischer Handwerker gewesen sei.[42]

Das Turiner Relief, dessen Provenienz wohl auf den ägyptischen oder den syro-levantinischen Bereich zurückzuführen ist, entwickelt diese somit durchaus populäre Verschmelzung alexandrinischer Handwerker weiter: Neben das Kauern und das Auswringen der Haare tritt das frontal auf den Betrachter ausgerichtete Gesicht. Während dieses Element bei den kleinformatigen Siegeln von Tel Kedesch nur erahnt werden konnte, lässt es sich im Falle des Reliefs klar

[37] *Exempli gratia*: Schroer 2011: Nos. 866–870; Schroer 2018: 1287f. 1319.1322.1560f. 1610.1616.1626.

[38] *Exempli gratia*: Bickel 2004: 74–77 Nos. 19f.

[39] Vgl. LIMC Aphrodite (in peripheria orientali) 182–195.

[40] Rhodos, Museum, Inventar-No. 14808. Vgl. LIMC Aphrodite 1027; Havelock 1995: Fig. 24.

[41] Athen, Benaki-Museum, Inventar-No. 2062. Vgl. LIMC Aphrodite 1038 = LIMC Aphrodite (in peripheria orientali) 189. Die Angaben in den LIMC-Beiträgen, die von unterschiedlichen Autoren stammen, variieren in der Datierung: spätes 2. Jahrhundert v.u.Z. (LIMC Aphrodite) vs. 4./3. Jahrhundert v.u.Z. (LIMC Aphrodite [in peripheria orientali]).

[42] Bspw. nach Lullies 1954: 83–87. Vgl. hierzu auch LIMC Aphrodite S. 104.

erkennen: Das Gesicht zeigt keineswegs das Antlitz der griechischen Liebesgöttin. Vielmehr beruft sich der gesamte Kopf inklusive der Ausgestaltung der perückenartigen Haare auf ägyptische bzw. syro-levantinische Traditionen. Als erstes zu nennen sind die Darstellungen des Kopfes der ägyptischen Göttin Hathor. Dieser wird frontal wiedergegeben und zeigt ein Gesicht in der Form eines auf die Spitze gedrehten Dreieckes mit abgerundeten Ecken. Während die Spitze das Kinn bildet, sind an den beiden anderen Ecken die oftmals tierähnlichen Ohren angebracht. Charakterisiert ist das Gesicht durch die mandelförmigen Augen, die eher breite Nase und die vollen Lippen. Als Rahmung dient eine dichte, mit Bändern zusammengebundene Haarpracht, welche zu beiden Seiten in einer einzelnen großen Locke endet.[43] Die Verbindung eines typischen Bildmotivs der Hathor mit der griechischen Göttin Aphrodite ergibt dabei durchaus Sinn, wurde doch gerade Hathor wegen ihrer Funktion als ägyptische Göttin der Liebe und der Schönheit in der *interpretatio graeca* mit Aphrodite gleichgesetzt.[44] Dieser Eindruck wird auch durch die Bekrönung der Göttin auf dem Turiner Relief bestärkt. So ist das Kuhgehörn mit Sonnenscheibe die typische Bekrönung der Göttin Hathor, auch wenn im Neuen Reich Hathor eng mit der Muttergöttin Isis verbunden wurde und sie sich seither denselben Kopfschmuck teilen.[45] Zugleich ist das frontal dargestellte Gesicht der Hathor auch bei anderen Göttinnen des syro-levantinischen Bereichs anzutreffen, wie bspw. bei den sogenannten nackten Göttinnen, weshalb mit der Wiedergabe des frontalen Gesichts eine Vielzahl von weiblichen Gottheiten bzw. Figuren repräsentiert wird.[46] In diesem Kontext ergeben auch die liegenden Löwen auf den Pfeilern Sinn, da ältere Darstellungen aus dem syro-levantinischen Bereich die nackte Göttin auf Löwen stehend zeigen.[47] Auch die Göttin auf dem Turiner Relief ist auf Tieren situiert, wenn auch kniend. Doch handelt es sich hierbei um Krokodile, die sicherlich weder auf Aphrodite, noch auf die anderen bereits erwähnten ägyptischen und syro-levantinischen Gottheiten zurückgeführt werden können. Vielmehr verweisen die Krokodile auf eine weitere ägyptische Göttin, die Kriegsgöttin Neith. So wurde Neith in älterer Zeit oftmals beim Säugen zweier Krokodile dargestellt.[48] Obwohl das Kriegerische der Göttin zunächst dem sonstigen Kontext von Schönheit, Liebe und Schöpfung (Muttergöttin) zu widersprechen scheint, darf nicht

[43] Vgl. bspw. Herrmann 1994: 260 Nos. 232–238; Schroer 2018: Nos. 1112f.

[44] Lurker 1987: 94 s.v. Hathor; Bonnet ^{3}2000: 277 s.v. Hathor.

[45] Lurker 1987: 108 s.v. Isis; Bonnet ^{3}2000: 328f s.v. Isis.

[46] Vgl. bspw. die sogenannten Astarte-Plaketten bei Çakmak 2011: 78, Fig. 19. Im Hellenismus wurde das Hathor-Bildmotiv sogar spezifisch für Gestalten der griechischen Mythologie übernommen: So wird Io, eine Geliebte des Zeus, aufgrund ihrer mythischen Verwandlung in eine Kuh auf Buckelschalen in Alexandria mit der Ikonographie der Hathor (frontal dargestelltes Gesicht, Kuhohren) wiedergegeben. Vgl. hierzu Pfrommer 1999: 38 Abb. 55.

[47] Vgl. hierzu Schroer 2011: Nos. 859–868.

[48] Herrmann 2002: 124.126 Katalog-No. 106.

vergessen werden, dass Neith als Kuh den Re geboren und in derselben Tierform auch den Osiris wiederhergestellt haben soll. Dadurch ist nicht nur ein Link zu Isis (Muttergöttin) gegeben, sondern auch zur Thematik (Schöpfung) sowie zur Ikonographie der Hathor (Kuhgestalt).

Zusammengefasst präsentiert das Turiner Relief eine komplexe Ikonographie, die wohl die Aspekte sexuelle Liebe, Schönheit, Schöpfung und Fruchtbarkeit anzusprechen scheint und dies durch die Verschmelzung von Aspekten verschiedenster Göttinnen (Aphrodite, Hathor, Isis, Astarte, nackte Göttin, Neith) bzw. unter Zuhilfenahme verschiedenster ikonographischer Elemente sowie durch die Kombination bekannter Bildmotive realisiert. Damit hat das Turiner Relief einen wichtigen Stellenwert innerhalb der Bildwelt des östlichen Hellenismus, zeigt es doch einerseits auf, dass bekannte griechische Motive Eingang in das Bildrepertoire der lokalen Handwerker gefunden haben, andererseits, dass diese griechischen Bildmotive nicht einfach Eins zu Eins reproduziert, sondern dass sie durchaus mit den lokalen Traditionen und Vorstellungen verknüpft worden sind. Dadurch bekräftigt das Turiner Relief die Beobachtungen von Herbert und Çakmak: Die frontale Gesichtsdarstellungen der Aphrodite Anadyomene auf den seleukidischen Siegelabdrücken von Tel Kedesch sind nicht nur gewollt, sondern knüpfen an lokale Bildtraditionen an. Somit handelt es sich wirklich um eine hybridisierte Aphrodite, bei welcher eines der beliebtesten griechischen Bildmotive des Hellenismus mit einer altehrwürdigen Bildtradition des Ostens kombiniert wurde. Dadurch wurde es möglich, eine Vielzahl von Betrachtern und Verehrer verschiedenster Gottheiten ähnlicher Aufgabenbereiche (Liebe, Schönheit, Schöpfung, Fruchtbarkeit) anzusprechen.

5. Fazit

Die eingangs formulierten Fragen zielten auf die konkrete Wiedergabe griechischer Bildmotive im hellenistischen Osten ab. Anhand einiger weniger ausgewählter, aber repräsentativer Stücke zur Darstellungsweise der griechischen Göttin Aphrodite konnte Folgendes beobachtet werden.

- Im Falle der Göttin Aphrodite war ein übergeordnetes Interesse an jenen Bildmotiven vorherrschend, die dem Thema des privaten Bades zugehörig sind. Die Darstellung eines solchen Moments war seit der Erschaffung der Knidischen Aphrodite durch Praxiteles in der zweiten Hälfte des 4. Jh. v.u.Z. in der griechischen Welt *en vogue*, da das thematische Umfeld es erlaubte, die Göttin der Liebe nackt wiederzugeben. So wurden auch im hellenistischen Osten zeitgenössisch relevante Bildmotive griechischen Ursprungs (Aphrodite von Knidos, kauernde Aphrodite des

Doidalsas, Aphrodite Anadyomene etc.), welche zur Zeit des Hellenismus durchaus bekannt waren, rezipiert. Es stellt sich jedoch die berechtigte Frage, ob bei der Reproduktion das Bildthema des Badens oder aber das Motiv der Nacktheit im Vordergrund stand? So ließ sich die neu geschaffene Nacktheit der griechischen Göttin bspw. in der Levante problemlos an die lokale Bildtradition der nackten Göttin anbinden.

- Wie die Beispiele der Figurine aus Tarsus, welche die Knidische Aphrodite wiedergibt, oder der Anadyomene-Figurine aus Marescha zeigen, wurden bekannte griechische Vorbilder in der lokalen Kleinkunst durchaus werkgetreu wiedergegeben. Andere Exemplare, wie die Figurinen aus Babylon, belegen dagegen, dass auch um weitere Elemente ergänzte Bildmotive griechischen Ursprungs – in diesem Fall eine beim Bade kauernde Aphrodite mit Schüssel, Handtuch, (Schmuck-)Kästchen und begleitenden Eroten – im Herrschaftsgebiet der Seleukiden Anklang fanden und reproduziert wurden.
- Von nicht geringer Relevanz sind jedoch die bildmotivischen Beobachtungen zu den Siegeln mit Aphrodite Anadyomene-Darstellungen von Tel Kedesch durch Herbert und Çakmak, welche durch das hier präsentierte Turiner Relief bekräftigt werden konnten. Bewusste Verschmelzungen griechischer Bildmotive mit traditionsreichen Bildmotiven und den damit verbundenen Vorstellungen des Alten Orients sind durchaus nachweisbar, auch wenn das Format oder der Erhaltungszustand die Identifizierung manchmal erheblich erschwert. Nichtsdestotrotz wurden einzelne Elemente griechischer Bildmotive für den lokalen Gebrauch bewusst angepasst. Manchmal geschah dies direkt, indem ein östliches Bildmotiv in ein griechisches Gewand gekleidet (Figurine der Nemesis), ein Gesicht komplett angepasst (Tel Kedesch-Siegel und Turiner Relief) oder ein bestimmte Attribut hinzugefügt wurde (Turiner Relief), manchmal jedoch auch nur indirekt durch die Schematisierung der Erscheinung (Tanit-Darstellungen als Vorbild für die Anadyomene-Siegelabdrücke von Tel Kedesch[49]).

Es konnte damit aufgezeigt werden, dass eine zu voreilig vorgenommene Zuweisung zu einem bestimmten Kulturkreis die Analyse der tatsächlich vorhandenen Aussage eines Stückes unnötig erschweren kann. Dementsprechend muss das vielfältige Bildmaterial aus den hellenistischen Reichen des Ostens stets im Hinblick auf die regionalen Kulturen betrachtet und analysiert werden. Für den Hellenismus im Osten muss dies großenteils noch geleistet werden.

[49]Çakmak 2011: 78f.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Andreae, Bernard, 2001, *Skulptur des Hellenismus*, München.

Arslan, Ermanno A., 1997, *Iside. Il mito, il mistero, la magia*, Mailand.

Beck, Herbert/Peter C. Bol/Maraike Bückling (eds.), 2005, *Ägypten – Griechenland – Rom. Abwehr und Berührung*, Liebighaus/Berlin.

Beckby, Hermann, [2]1965, *Anthologia Graeca. Buch XII – XVI. Griechisch-Deutsch. Mit Namen- und Sachverzeichnis und anderen vollständigen Registern*, München.

Bickel, Susanne, 2004, *In ägyptischer Gesellschaft. Aegyptiaca der Sammlungen BIBEL+ORIENT der Universität Freiburg Schweiz*, Fribourg.

Bollati, Ariela, 2003, Le figure „dinoccolate" sui sigilli di Seleucia al Tigri: adattamento di un motivo greco al gusto orientale o conseguenza di un processo produttivo?, in: Enrico Acquaro/Pierfrancesco Callieri (eds.), *Transmarinae Imagines. Studi sulla tramissione delle iconografie tra Mediterraneo e Asia in età classica ed ellenistica*, Sarzana, 131–148.

Bonnet, Hans, [3]2000, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*, Hamburg.

Çakmak, Lisa Ayla, 2011, A Hybridized Aphrodite: The Anadyomene Motif at Tel Kedesh, in: Anna Kouremenos/Sujatha Chandrasekaran/Roberto Rossi (eds.), *From Pella to Gandhara. Hybridisation and Identity in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East* (British Archaeological Reports International Series 2221), Oxford, 65–84.

Erlich, Adi/Amos Kloner, 2008, *Maresha Excavations Final Report II. Hellenistic Terracotta Figurines from the 1989–1996 Seasons* (Israel Antiquities Authority Reports 35), Jerusalem.

Fisher, N. R. E., 1992, *Hybris. A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*, Warminster.

Havelock, Christine Mitchell, 1995, *The Aphrodite of Knidos and her Successors: A Historical Review of the Female Nude in Greek Art*, Ann Arbor.

Herbert, Sharon C., 2004/05, The Hellenistic Archives from Tel Kedesh (Israel) and Seleucia-on-the-Tigris (Iraq): *Bulletin of the University of Michigan Museums of Art and Archaeology* 15, 65–86.

Herbert, Sharon C., 2023, *The University of Michigan and University of Minnesota Excavations at Tel Kedesh. Vol. I: The Hellenistic Archive and its Sealings. With contributions by Donald T. Ariel, Andrea M. Berlin, Paul Lesperance, and Anastasia Shapiro* (ASOR Archaeological Report Series 30), Alexandria, VA.

Herrmann, Christian, 1994, *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 138), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Herrmann, Christian, 2002, *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel II* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 184), Fribourg/Göttingen.

Hölscher, Tonio, [4]2015, *Klassische Archäologie. Grundwissen*, Darmstadt.

Karvonen-Kannas, Kerrtu, 1995, *The Seleucid and Parthian Terracotta Figurines from Babylon in the Iraq Museum, the British Museum and the Louvre* (Monografie di Mesopotamia 4), Florenz.

Keel, Othmar/Silvia Schroer, 2004, *Eva – Mutter alles Lebendigen. Frauen- und Göttinnenidole aus dem Alten Orient*, Fribourg/Göttingen.

Kramer, Gerhard, 1923/24, Stilphasen der hellenistischen Plastik: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 38/39, 138–184.

Küthmann, Harald/Bernhard Overbeck/Dirk Steinhilber/Ingrid Weber, 1973, *Bauten Roms auf Münzen und Medaillen*, München.

LIMC = Fondation pour le Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (ed.), 1981–2009, *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 10 Bde. (in 20 Teilen), Zürich/München.

Lullies, Reinhard, 1954, *Die kauernde Aphrodite*, München-Pasing.

Lurker, Manfred, 1987, *Lexikon der Götter und Symbole der alten Ägypter*, Darmstadt.

Pfrommer, Michael, 1999, *Alexandria. Im Schatten der Pyramiden* (Sonderbände der antiken Welt; Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie), Mainz.

Schroer, Silvia, 2011, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient. Eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern. Band 3: Die Spätbronzezeit*, Fribourg/Göttingen.

Schroer, Silvia, 2018, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient. Eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern. Band 4: Die Eisenzeit bis zum Beginn der achämenidischen Herrschaft*, Basel.

Smith, Roland Ralph Redfern, 2014, *Hellenistic Sculpture*, London.

Stern, Ian/Donald T. Ariel, 2020, Archive Discovered Under Maresha: *Biblical Archaeological Review* 46/5, 46–51.

IDENTITY WRIT SMALL: SEAL IMAGERY IN SELEUCID PALESTINE

Andrea M. Berlin and Sharon C. Herbert

In the world and time of the classical East, multiple ethnoi *lived tightly packed within the confined territory of the southern Levant. Tyrians, Judeans, Idumeans (among others) differentiated themselves by distinct languages, scripts, gods, calendars, and legal precepts. Yet all shared the fate of living under outside political dominion – the Achaemenid Persians, Ptolemies, and Seleucids – who introduced other alphabets, languages, ways of marking time, gods, rituals, and social ranks. People used visual means in part to cope with the cultural cacophony, especially objects that allowed the expression of personal and group identities. Chief among these were seal rings. Here we discuss the meanings conveyed by impressions from three rings, found among more than 2000 such impressions from a mid-second century BCE archive at Tel Kedesh, in northern Israel. Each conveys a different pictorial mode and channels a distinct cultural milieu. We argue that their differences may be read as a kind of call-and-response, revealing how people in this place and time chose to represent themselves individually and collectively.*

In this short article we focus on three clay sealings, three of the 2043 found in two rooms of a large Seleucid administrative compound at the site of Kedesh, in northeastern Israel. Kedesh is an enormous ancient mound, first settled in the 3rd millennium BCE, and occupied sporadically until 1948. The administrative compound, which sits at the far southern end, was constructed around 500 BCE, when this region was under Achaemenid Persian rule. When the site and the wider territory passed from the Persians to the Ptolemies around 300 BCE, the new rulers appropriated the compound and made substantial changes in floor plan and function. They moved the entrance from the building's eastern side to its north, added an elaborately decorated reception room and multiple store-rooms, and inserted rooms with plastered measuring bins on the south side. After 197 BCE, when the entire region came into the hands of the Seleucids, the building's new owners made a few more modifications, among which was the construction of an archive complex in the northwestern corner.[1] It was in two rooms here that we discovered the clay sealings, nicely fired thanks to a deliberate episode of burning in or shortly after the structure's almost-final abandonment around 143 BCE.

[1] For the date of the battle of Paneion and the Seleucid takeover of Coele-Syria and Palestine, see now Lorber 2021.

From the vantage point of the subject of imagery between Near Eastern and Greek pictorial traditions from the later 5th through the early 3rd centuries BCE, and especially the relationship of that imagery to religious beliefs and practices, these sealings may not seem too relevant. For one thing, they date about a century later than the stated end point of the span of investigation; for another, they are legal, personal, and administrative in character, rather than religious. Yet we believe they are worthy of consideration, for two reasons. First, in their overall mass as well as their individual subjects, they represent the largest trove of contemporaneous images from a single site yet discovered in the southern Levant. And second, the great majority of the legible sealings, something like 98%, are *un*-official. This means that they reveal to us something that is otherwise almost impossible to see: the pictorial choices of private individuals in a specific time and place. Each sealing displays the one image that somebody decided to use to represent him or herself – and since an astounding array of choices existed here, we may see in these decisions considered thinking rather than rote habit.

Before discussing these particular three sealings, it behooves us to consider the phenomenon of communicating and self-representing via pictures. In the conference call that gave rise to this paper, the organizers used the helpful phrase "the processes of interference" as a way to classify Persianization and Hellenization, in opposition to "the expressions of peoples' own cultural identities." In our opinion, *all* aspects of interaction are process; they represent new cultural or political forces working like heavy wave action on native bedrock, while we, from our far remove, try to assess the resulting effects. Images are an especially salient mode for investigating such interactions. First, the combination of subject and style forms a particular visual amalgam, which may convey a particular message. Second, that amalgam transcends language, that most daunting of communicative hurdles. In today's highly networked, connected world this last point may be readily appreciated. Globalization and the need to cross linguistic divides has meant that image-based communication has steadily risen over the past half-century. The increased use of symbols, icons, and pictures has gone hand-in-hand with the steady growth of international travel, multinational companies, and perhaps most of all the phenomenon of peoples speaking different languages settling in new places.

To return to antiquity and to the "native bedrock" of the southern Levant, we see a similar set of circumstances. Over the course of the preceding two centuries peoples here witnessed – and also participated in – international travel and multinational business operations. They regularly confronted people speaking different languages, some of whom also settled in new places. In the Persian and Hellenistic periods (and of course others as well) the southern Levant was home to multiple *ethnoi* living in close quarters: Sidonians and Tyrians, Judeans and Idumeans, Nabateans and Itureans. They wrote in different scripts, worshipped

different gods, and followed their own calendars and legal precepts. They all experienced the same "processes of interference," meaning the dominion of Achaemenid Persia, Ptolemaic Egypt, and Seleucid Syria, whose representatives introduced still other alphabets and languages, calendars, gods, rituals, and social ranks. Just as today, images would have helped people surmount the hurdles of differences and represent themselves to others.

This is borne out by the overwhelmingly *pictorial* character of seals and sealings, as seen in both the Kedesh archive and also the mid-4th century archive found in the Wadi ed-Daliyeh. Both offer a sharp contrast to earlier groups from this region, as for example, the bullae from an administrative archive in Jerusalem of the later 7th and early 6th centuries BCE – which all carry writing, solely. In her publication of the Wadi ed-Daliyeh bullae, Mary Joan Winn Leith named the various influences impinging on peoples' image selections as "the internationalist atmosphere of the Persian period … and the subtly compelling factors of prestige and/or cultural receptivity."[2] All true – and all resting on the fundamental acceptance of pictures as a form of direct, personal communication.

The three sealings from Kedesh that we present here are:

- one with a schematic image of the Phoenician lunar deity Tanit, below which are two lines in either Phoenician or Aramaic that read "אש על ארץ/ He who is over the land";
- one with a shaft of wheat and bunch of grapes, belong which is a single line of Greek reading "Κυδίσσου/of Kedesh";
- one with a lioness or panther in profile, head frontal, one paw raised and holding a javelin.

Let us first put these sealings into the overall context of the archive at Kedesh. **Fig. 1** breaks down the archive's legible sealings according to original seals and category. 48% of the seals depict Greek gods, including Olympian deities – Zeus, Aphrodite, Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Dionysus, Hermes, and also non-Olympians – Eros, Helios, Nike, Tyche. 20% depict heroes – Odysseus, Achilles, Diomedes, and Herakles – and also humans, in naturalistic style. 17% carry realistic portrait heads. This brings the total of human imagery in Greek subjects and styles to 85%. 13% bear realistic images of symbols, animals, or plants – such as our Kedesh sealing. In other words, 98% of the imagery is Hellenizing in subject and/or style. Fantastic animals such as our armed feline comprise 1%, and non-Greek deities such as Ashtarte, Harpocrates, and our Tanit appear on a fraction of the 1% of inscribed sealings.[3]

[2] Leith 1997: 10.

[3] These figures represent a re-assessment of the total corpus as of August 2019. Cf. now Herbert 2023.



Fig. 1: Breakdown of the subjects represented by the seals attested in the archive at Tel Kedesh.

These numbers reveal a place and time in which almost everybody embraced the image-filled world of Greek culture. To return to the concept of "processes of interference," the figures do not reveal those processes themselves, but they do reflect hundreds of individuals opting in, riding the heavy waves of the Greek aesthetic.[4] In contrast, the few eastern subjects and styles are a tiny bit of native bedrock jutting out. As in the natural world, we need to consider them parts of a single eco-system.

The Tanit sealing (**Fig. 2**) is one of nine made from the same seal, a ratio that is unusual for the Kedesh archive, where the vast majority of sealings are single impressions from unique seals. Based on the intact impressions, the seal was about 19 mm long. This precise combination of image and inscription is repeated on a tenth sealing, which was made from a second seal.

[4] Messina 2021 has termed the cultural moment in the Near East at this time as the "Hellenistic mainstream," which he describes as a specific instantiation of the processes connected with network dynamics brought about by globalization.

Fig. 2: Impression of the "Tanit" seal
(Herbert 2023: 544, INS/T 1G).

In their 2003 *BASOR* publication, Donald Ariel and Joseph Naveh noted that the first part of the inscription, "אש על/He who is over" is known from two Phoenician inscriptions, one from Carthage and another from the Piraeus, the port of Athens.[5] The specific full phrase "אש על ארץ/He who is over the land" is unattested in Phoenician or Hebrew, although very similar formulations occur in both languages. From Larnax Lapithos, near Larnaca on Cyprus, comes a stone inscribed "אש על לפש/He who is over Lapithos," dated to the 4th century BCE on paleographic grounds. From Jerusalem the phrase "אשר על הבית/He who is over the house (palace or temple)" occurs on two seals, several sealings, and the Royal Steward inscription, all dating to the late Iron Age. These parallels suggest that while the specific title is unique, the phrasing is common in this regional milieu.

As for the image, some scholars have recently disputed the identification of this figure as Tanit, or indeed even as necessarily female. With respect, we disagree; and will continue to refer to this schematic image of triangle body, stick arms, and circle head as Tanit, a figure that appears in many media and modes in Levantine coastal cities, Carthage, and elsewhere in the Punic sphere. The image is remarkably long-lived and stable in its form. Its first known appearance dates to the 11th century BCE, in the form of a small copper alloy charm found at Megiddo, in Israel's Jezreel Valley.[6] The Megiddo figure is very close to the

[5] Ariel and Naveh 2003: 63.

[6] Arie 2017. For earlier studies of the Tanit symbol see Bertrandy 1992: 416–418 and Avaliani 1999. For the Tanit symbol in the Levant see Dothan 1974, updated in Bordreuil 1987. Additional inscriptions and archaeological finds with the Tanit symbol are noted in

version on the Kedesh sealing, which dates some 900 years later. As Arie notes, early on Tanit had a regular epithet – *Panei Baʿal*, the face or mouth of Baʿal, and as such stands for, or with, the primary male deity of the Canaanite/Phoenician heartland. In the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, this symbol became common on items with official or administrative functions, such as lead weights, coins, and seals, primarily from the cities of Aradus, Berytus, and Tyre.[7] It's worth noting that this particular development occurs at a time when the Phoenician cities were under the overarching dominions of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, imperial regimes with Macedonian roots. If we agree that people chose images in order to represent themselves to others, then we would argue that the choice to depict an age-old local deity on administrative objects is a fine instance of the resilience of this particular outcrop of native bedrock.[8]

Another thought about this symbol as affirmation of native authority is inspired by an assemblage of impressed jar handles published by Ibrahim Kawkabani. The handles, all from large storage jars, were found in the 1972 excavations of a temple precinct dedicated to Melqart at Jal el-Bahr, on the northeastern outskirts of Tyre.[9] There are 160 different impressions, and almost all are strictly writing, without any images at all. The few images that do appear are small and cursory: a caduceus on three impressions; a running animal on one; and on one Tanit.[10]

The handles are dated to the Seleucid era, and range from 205/4 to 133/2 BCE, making them largely contemporary with the group of Tanit sealings from Kedesh. We are struck by the prevalence of writing, the dearth of images overall, and the single depiction of Tanit in particular. We wonder if we might regard the Jal el-Bahr handles as an "in-house" assemblage, made by locals for their own use in a local place. In other words, these impressions – and their owners – were not communicating with the outside world – unlike the Kedesh seals and sealings, and the city weights of Aradus and Tyre, which were made to convey official authority precisely to outsiders. An additional point is that the

Bordreuil 1987: 81–82. For a group of ceramic *tesserae* with an inscription dedicated to Tanit as well as the Tanit symbol and a dolphin, see Bordreuil and Gubel 1988: 443, No. III.4; Wolfe and Sternberg 1989: 10, No. 4. Bordreuil dates the group paleographically to the 3rd–2nd centuries BCE; see also Stager 1991: 22, 31. In 2015, the Tanit symbol was reported on lead scale weights produced in Aradus as well as Tyre: Finkielsztejn 2015: 60–63, Nos. 1–2, 5, 10–15, 17–41, 43–54. The Aradus weights are undated. The Tanit symbol on these weights is 'defective,' i.e., without a baseline (Finkielsztejn 2015: 56). Tyre: Finkielsztejn 2015: 89–91, Nos. 129–146, 150–153. These scale weights are attributed to Tyre only because of the Tanit symbol found upon them (Finkielsztejn 2010: 88).

[7] Arie 2017: 67; for Tanit on city weights of Tyre see Finkielsztejn 2014.

[8] For our most current summary of the meaning of this sealing, see Herbert 2003: 374–378.

[9] Kawkabani 2003; Kawkabani 2005: 4; 2008: 2, Fig. 1.

[10] Kawkabani 2005: 61, J-B 140. The date given here is based on a new, independent study by Donald Ariel (2019). We thank the author for sharing his results.

Fig. 3: Impression of the "Kedesh" seal
(Herbert 2023: 544, INS 5).

seal and weights date to a time when their cities were under a foreign administration. Reading Tanit in this context, we see that she is large and on top, a superior entity – at least in design.

The official who owned the Tanit sealing is not the only one represented in the Kedesh archive. There is also a single sealing from a seal of the city itself (**Fig. 3**). The sealing, intact and complete, is 14 mm in length, a bit smaller than the Tanit sealings. In the upper portion is a central stalk with two leaves growing from it. Surmounting the stalk is an ear of wheat, and hanging from the left leaf is a grape cluster. A single line below in Greek reads Κυδίσσου.

As Ariel and Naveh reported in their 2003 publication, Κυδίσσου is the genitive case of Κύδισσος, one of twenty spellings for Kedesh attested over a period of five and a half centuries, from the Zenon archive of 259 BCE to the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius in c. 300 CE. The spelling found here is otherwise known only from Eusebius. The remarkable number of variations is a result of the name being translated from a three-consonant Hebrew original קדש; the variations are the result of having to supply vowels in Greek, and also of disagreement about the second and third consonants. What this indicates is that, like the unique title of the Tanit seal, here too the seal's artisan – or whoever commissioned it – was starting from scratch, making up the Greek spelling as well as the site's representative imagery.

Ariel and Naveh noted that this hybrid depiction of wheat and grapes has no ancient parallel, but may have been inspired by the regular combination in the Hebrew Bible of grain (דגן, *dgn*) and new wine (תירש, *tyrš*).[11] This has a certain

[11] Ariel and Naveh 2003: 74. They note also that the pairing of grain and wine is also found in a Phoenician text, but from centuries earlier, and in Cilicia: Gibson 1982: 53, 55. On

poetic appeal, but we are not convinced that this image was crafted with a biblical connection in mind. If that was the intent, then why translate the site's name from Hebrew into Greek? But more to the point, there is no indication that anybody who worked or visited here had any connection with Judea, or would have read the Hebrew Bible. Kedesh was embedded in a market network anchored by the coastal cities of Tyre and Akko-Ptolemais; its sphere was southern Phoenicia. We believe instead that this image was intended to convey what somebody considered essential about the city. In that regard, one need not travel far: the mound is surrounded by all the evidence necessary to understand this depiction. The upland valley around Kedesh is today home to some of the best vineyards for Cabernet Sauvignon grapes in all of Israel; while in the adjacent Hula Valley, experimental cultivars of *triticum aestivum*, bread wheat, had been introduced already in the 3rd century BCE.[12]

The Kedesh sealing thus advertises the site's current cultural affiliations and importance: a Hellenized property with a bountiful agricultural pedigree. We might compare this manifestation of local interest with the statement sent by the Tanit seal: Greek vs. Phoenician in alphabet and language; specific name vs. anonymous official; naturalistic rendition of here-and-now commodities vs. schematic rendering of a cosmic power. The contrasts show up, and gather force, when we imagine these objects – or more properly their users – in dialogue with one another.

The last sealing to consider depicts a feline standing in profile on a ground line, slender and tautly muscled, with a long, curled tail and frontal head, brandishing a javelin in a raised paw (**Fig. 4**). There is only one such impression, deriving from a seal of 11 mm in length. The pose is fantastic, the motif eastern, the origin unknown.[13] In style and attitude this animal is very similar to several of those sculpted on the Tobiad compound known as the Qasr el-ʿAbd (**Fig. 5**), at ʿIraq el-Emir on the outskirts of ancient Philadelphia (modern-day Amman). In fact they are so close that we are tempted to suggest that our fantastic feline was a symbol of the Tobiad house.

seals and coins similar combinations are represented side by side, or bunched together. See two ring bezels in Westenholz 1998: 76, No. 27–28. Both derive from the Wolfe family collection, and were reexamined by Ariel. No. 28 is described by Westenholz as an ear of barley, but it appears to be an upright ear of wheat. Like the sealing it too has two leaves emerging symmetrically from a central stalk. But there the resemblance ends. Both ring bezels are anepigraphic, and smaller and cruder in execution than the sealing. On the other hand a well-executed stalk of wheat is depicted (alone) on one of the bilingual sealings published by Bordreuil (1996: 51, No. IIa).

[12] Berlin et al. 2003.

[13] An impression from Artashat shows a panther moving right and holding thyrsus (Khachatrian 1996: Pl. 75, No. 33).

Fig. 4: Impression of the "armed feline" seal
(Herbert 2023: 531, AQF 2).

Fig. 5: One of the feline relief sculptures on the Qasr el-ʿAbd,
ʿIraq el-Emir, Jordan (Photo: Andrea M. Berlin).

The protective felines on the Qasr el-ʿAbd's exterior recall those performing the same function in Babylon, on the Ishtar Gate and also along the processional way into the city. Just as those, the Qasr's lions are large three-dimensional sculpted beings, promenading on the outside of a building. They are similar to the animal on the Kedesh sealing, which is not simply walking but is armed, and deliberately confrontational. Whether we read the Kedesh sealing as Tobiad or not, both it and the lions on the Qasr send a similar message, an evocation of the still powerful glamour of Babylon and other great Mesopotamian cities.

One way to read these images is as statements of cultural persistence, outcrops of the region's native bedrock.[14] In this way they function as other similar phenomena of retention, for example names of settlements. But if we consider the larger pictorial context of the era, we can press still more meaning from them. Against the backdrop of the Kedesh archive's overwhelmingly Greek character, we may read another dichotomy – not between east and west, between Mesopotamia and the Levant on the one side and Greece on the other, but one even more essential: the choice between old and new; between the world of the past and that of the present; the choice, in effect, of whether or not to be modern.

At Kedesh in the 2nd century BCE, most people choose modernity. Why? There is, of course, the allure of Greek subjects and styles. But there is more as well. This is a new, image-filled world, one with people on the move, getting educated and becoming literate. Written communication between regular folks is more common. It is these phenomena that are the real "processes of interference," the heavy waves washing in. The sealings from Kedesh are reflections of people embracing those processes, diving into the water as it were. As always and everywhere, a few hold back, unseduced. But these small objects show us that for the overwhelming majority, the water is fine.

References

Arie, Eran, 2017, The Earliest Known 'Sign of Tanit' Revealed in 11th Century BCE Building at Megiddo: *Tel Aviv* 44, 61–71.

Ariel, Donald T., 2019, Understanding the Jal el-Bahr Storage-Jar Assemblage: *Journal of Hellenistic Pottery* 4, 3–27.

Ariel, Donald T., and Joseph Naveh, 2003, Selected Inscribed Sealings from Kedesh in the Upper Galilee: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 329, 61–80.

Avaliani, Ekaterina, 1999, The Cult of Tanit, in the Context of the Punic Cultural Model of North Africa: *Numismatica e Antichità Classiche* 28, 25–35.

Berlin, Andrea, Terry Ball, Robert Thompson, and Sharon Herbert, 2003, Ptolemaic Agriculture, 'Syrian Wheat,' and Triticum aestivum: *Journal of Archaeological Science* 30.1, 115–121.

Bertrandy, François, 1992, Signe de Tanit, in: Édouard Lipiński (ed.), *Dictionnaire de la civilization phénicienne et punique*, Turnhout, 416–418.

Bordreuil, Pierre, 1987, Tanit du Liban (Nouveaux documents religieux phéniciens III), in: Édouard Lipiński (ed.), *Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean*

[14] Messina (2021) discusses this same phenomenon of the local materializing within a globalized context via sealings, royal iconography, and a newly monumentalized cityscape at Seleucia-on-the-Tigris.

in the First Millennium B.C. Proceedings of the Conference held in Leuven from the 14th to the 16th of November 1985 (Studia Phoenicia 5; Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 22), Leuven, 79–85.

Bordreuil, Pierre, 1996, Bulles et poids de Tyr, in: Enrico Acquaro (ed.), *Alle soglie della classicità. Il Mediterraneo tra tradizione e innovazione. Studi in onore die Sabatino Moscati, vol. 1: Storia e cultura*, Pisa, 47–58.

Bordreuil, Pierre, and Eric Gubel, 1988, Bulletin d'antiquités archéologiques du Levant inédites ou méconnues V: *Syria* 65, 437–456.

Dothan, Moshe, 1974, A Sign of Tanit from Tell Akko: *Israel Exploration Journal* 24, 44–49.

Finkielsztejn, Gérald, 2010, The Maresha Scale Weights: Metrology, Administration and History, in: Amos Kloner, Esther Eshel, Hava B. Korzakova, and Gerald Finkielsztejn (eds.), *Maresha Excavations Final Report III: Epigraphic Finds from the 1989–2000 Seasons* (Israel Antiquities Authority Reports 45), Jerusalem, 175–192.

Finkielsztejn, Gérald, 2014, Poids et étalons au Levant à l'époque hellénistique: *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne, Suppl.* 12: 163–182.

Finkielsztejn, Gérald, 2015, The Weight Standards of the Hellenistic Levant, Part Two: The Evidence of the Phoenician Scale Weights: *Israel Numismatic Review* 10: 55–104.

Gibson, John C. L., 1982, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions, Vol. 3: Phoenician Inscriptions*, Oxford.

Herbert, Sharon C., 2023. *The University of Michigan and University of Minnesota Excavations at Tel Kedesh. Vol. I: The Hellenistic Archive and its Sealings. With contributions by Donald T. Ariel, Andrea M. Berlin, Paul Lesperance, and Anastasia Shapiro* (ASOR Archaeological Report Series 30), Alexandria, VA.

Kawkabani, Ibrahim, 2003, Les anses timbrées de Jal el-Bahr: *Archaeology and History in Lebanon* 17: 95–99.

Kawkabani (Kaoukabani), Ibrahim, 2005, Les estampilles phéniciennes de Tyr: *Archaeology and History in Lebanon* 21: 3–79.

Kawkabani, Ibrahim, 2008, Les anses timbrées en grec de Jal el-Bahr (Tyr): *Archaeology and History in Lebanon* 28: 2–65.

Khachatrian, Z'ores, 1996, The Archives of Sealings Found at Artashat (Artaxata), in: Marie-Françoise Boussac and Antonio Invernizzi (eds.), *Archives et Sceaux du Monde Hellénistique*, Athens, 365–370.

Leith, Mary J. W., 1997, *Wadi Daliyeh I: The Wadi Daliyeh Seal Impressions* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 24), Oxford.

Lorber, Catharine C., 2021, Numismatic Evidence and the Chronology of the Fifth Syrian War, in: Sylvie Honigman, Christophe Nihan, and Oded Lipschits (eds.), *Times of Transition. Judea in the Early Hellenistic Period* (Mosaics 1), Tel Aviv, 31–41.

Messina, Vito, 2021, Beyond Greece and Babylonia Global and Local at Seleucia on the Tigris, in: Michael Blömer, Stefan Riedel, Miguel John

Versluys, and Engelbert Winter (eds.), *Common Dwelling Place of all the Gods. Commagene in its Local, Regional, and Global Context*, Stuttgart, 381–406.

Stager, Lawrence E., 1991, *Ashkelon Discovered: From Canaanites and Philistines to Romans and Moslems*, Washington, DC.

Westenholz, J. Goodnick, 1998, *Sacred Bounty, Sacred Land: The Seven Species of the Land of Israel*, Jerusalem.

Wolfe, L. Alexander, and Frank Sternberg, 1989, *Objects with Semitic Inscriptions 1100 B.C.–A.D. 700. Jewish, Early Christian and Byzantine Antiquities. Auction XXIII, Monday 20 November 1989*, Zurich.

INDEX OF PLACE NAMES

Abu Gurob 114, 150
Abusir 114
Abydos 114, 121
Achzib 114, 179
Aderet 71, 81
Aelia Capitolina 129
ʿAin al-Baida 78
ʿAin Manawir 189
Akko, Akko-Ptolemais 45, 50, 60, 103, 114, 121, 129, 149, 151, 190, 261
Alexandria 14, 56, 131, 133, 136f, 141, 144, 149, 249
al-Mina 115
Almuñécar 114
Amargetti 178, 183, 190
Amarna 130
Amathus 118f, 150
Amman 78f, 82f, 262
ʿAmra 81
Amrit 114, 121, 151
ʿAnata 87
Antioch-on-the-Orontes 14, 239
Apameia 14
Apollonia-Arsuf 169, 172f, 177, 179–181, 188
Aradus 259f
Arslan Tash 113f, 118, 185
Artashat/Artaxata 261
Ashkelon 45, 50, 114, 123f, 126f, 129, 179, 190, 192, 195
Athribis 114, 123f
ʿAtlit 82, 114, 149, 163, 179
Attika 1, 6, 43
Babylon 199, 242, 251, 262
Bahariya Oasis 114
Banias 54
Beersheba 77, 88, 91f, 170, 178–180, 192, 194, 200
Behbeit el-Hagar 114, 124
Beirut 114
Beit ʿAniya 70
Beit Nir 178, 182, 185–187, 191
Berytus 259
Beth-Shean 78, 88f, 170, 178–180, 187f
Beth-Shemesh 77, 82, 101
Bethsaida/et-Tell 170, 179, 187f
Bostan esh-Sheikh 1, 3f, 8, 10–12, 14f, 19, 22f, 24, 26–30, 33f, 36, 126
Bubastis 114, 124
Byblos 3, 5, 19, 114, 125, 131, 189, 196
Caesarea Maritima 129
Cagliari 114
Capua 105
Carthage 22, 31, 99, 113, 258
Cycladic Islands 1
Dan 151, 169, 179, 189f
Deir el-Medineh 130
Delphi 11
Dendera 116, 124, 145
Desouk 114
Deve Hüyük 113f, 222–226, 229f, 232
Diospolis-Lydda 129
Dor 41–54, 57–63, 88, 101–103, 105–107, 164, 168f, 177, 179f, 182, 194–199, 223, 229, 231
Ebla 29, 83, 102
Edfu 128, 134f, 152
El-ʿAzariya 70f, 73, 77f, 80, 84

El Castellar 114
el-ʿUmeiri 82
el-Khadr 99
el-Kurru 103, 114
Elephantine 24, 29
Eleutheropolis 129
Emar 29, 82
ʿEn Gannim 72
En-Gedi 87, 170, 179
Eryx 126
Eshtemoa 72
Fajjum 238
Falerii 105
Gabl el-Tayr 142
Galyub 105
Gandhara 147
Ganim 72
Gaugamela 53
Gaza 146
Gerasa 186
Gezer 78, 88–92, 114, 190, 228
Gibeon/el-Ǧib 170, 179, 182, 189f
Givʿat Shaul 71, 81, 87, 89f, 92
Giza 114, 124
Gorgippa 101
Guzana 184
Halicarnassus 7
Hama 131
Har Ḥoma 71, 81
Hebron 72, 81
Heracleion 124
Herodion 81
Hibis Oasis 113f
Hierakonpolis/Kom el-Ahmar 114
Hierapolis 106
Hilalia 194
Ḥorvat Abu Haf 81
Ḥorvat ʿAli 74
Ḥorvat ʿAqaf 177
Ḥorvat Ḥazzan 71, 81, 84, 92
Ḥorvat Naẓur 90
Ḥorvat Rosh Zayit 87f
Ibiza 99f, 114
ʿIraq el-Emir 82, 84, 261
Issos 53
Izmir 102
Jaffa 45, 177, 179
Jal el-Bahr 259
Jenin 72
Jericho 81, 170, 179
Jerusalem 71f, 74, 77, 80–82, 84, 101, 114, 130, 174, 179, 256, 258
  City of David 84, 170
  French Hill 71, 84
  Givʿati Parking Lot 221
  Jewish Quarter 87–89
  Mount of Olives 71, 87f, 90–92
  Mount Scopus 70f, 74, 84
  Ofel 99
  Rogem Gannim 71, 89
  Shmuel Hanavi St. 84
  Western Wall Plaza 186
Jubara 71, 74, 80
Karanis 82
Karnak 129f
Kedesh → Tel Kedesh
Kharayeb 62, 162, 164f, 168, 177–180, 188, 196, 199, 207
Khirbet Abu-Musarraḥ 87
Khirbet Aristobulia 81
Khirbet esh-Sheraf 127
Khirbet et-Tannur 186f
Khirbet Qeiyafa 99, 100f, 106
Khirbet Rabiʿa 81
Khirbet Yama 88–90
Kition 22, 24, 114, 197f
Kition-Bamboula 197f
Knidos 241, 251
Knossos 102
Kom el-Hisn 114
Kom Firin 114

Kos 241f
Kuntillet ʿAjrud 227
Lachish 101, 113f, 149f, 170, 179, 199f
Larnax Lapithos 258
Latakia 114
Maʿon 72
Madeba 29
Makkedah 173, 179
Makmish 169, 172, 177, 179–183, 188, 196, 198
Maresha 77, 81, 84f, 101, 103, 107, 163f, 167, 169–171, 173, 175, 178f, 180, 182, 185–187, 191, 194, 199f, 202, 205, 240, 243f, 251
Masada 81
Megiddo 87, 112, 114, 149, 170, 179, 258
Memphis 28, 114, 123f, 147, 226
Mendes 114, 123f, 134f, 152
Meqabelein 179
Meẓadot-Yehuda 87
Meẓad Ḥashavyahu 90f
Mit-Rahina 124
Miẓpe Yammim 170, 179, 189
Mount Ebal 87
Mount Qusʿqam 142
Moẓa 78, 88
Muʿallaqat al-Dayr 82
Muqablein 82
Naukratis 124, 151
Neapolis 129
Nimrud 113f, 118
Noqdim 87
Olympia 114
Palmyra 29, 31–34
Paphos 139f, 153
Paros 7
Persepolis 5f, 53, 227
Petra 29, 84, 178
Philadelphia 261
Piraeus 31, 258
Praeneste 119f, 150
Puig des Molins 114
Qantir 112, 114, 149f
Qasr el-ʿAbd 261f
Ramat ha-Nadiv 177, 179f, 191
Ramat Raḥel 170, 173, 179
Raphia 129
Ras Abu Maʿaruf/Pisgat Ze'ev 71, 74, 84
Ras esh-Sheikh ʿAnbar 71, 84
Revadim 151
Rosh ha-ʿAyin 88–91
Rumana 88f
Sabratha 130
Saft el-Henna 114
Sais 114, 124
Saqqara 124
Sam'al 185
Samaria 114, 179
Samos 228f
Saqqara 114, 123, 226, 229
Sarepta 179
Segesta 126
Seleucia-on-the-Tigris 240, 245, 263
Sepphoris 173, 179
Shavei Zion 168, 179
Shechem 72
Shiloh 87
Shivta 81
Sidon 1–10, 12, 14f, 19, 23, 28f, 31, 41, 43–45, 52, 126, 145f, 242
Sulcis 114
Sultantepe 84
Taanach 107
Tanis/San el-Hagar 114, 117, 124, 128, 150
Tarent 105

Tarragona 114
Tarsus 241, 251
Tartus 114
Tel ʿErani 170f, 176 178f, 180, 200
Tel ʿIra 89–92
Tel Anafa 177, 179
Tel Batash 88f
Tel Dor → Dor
Tel Ḥalif 169f, 172, 178–181, 184f, 191–195, 199f, 206
Tel Haror 223, 229, 231
Tel Kedesh 45, 61, 103, 163, 179, 240, 244–246, 249–251, 255–257, 259–263
Tel Mevorakh 223, 226, 229, 233
Tel Michal 183
Tel Nagila 90f
Tel Ẓafit/Tell eṣ-Ṣafi/Gath 88, 170f, 177, 179–181, 188, 200
Tel Ẓippor 162, 164, 169–171, 179, 180, 188, 192, 194–196, 200f
Tell Abu Ḥawam 179, 196
Tell Afis 82
Tell Beit Mirsim 91
Tell Deir ʿAlla 190
Tell el-ʿAǧul 113, 150, 190
Tell el-Farʿah North 78, 88
Tell el-Farʿah South 190
Tell el-Herr 226
Tell el-Hesi 190
Tell el-Maskhuta 124
Tell en-Naṣbeh 170, 179
Tell es-Saʿidiyeh 179
Tell Jemmeh 172f, 179, 186, 222–226, 228, 230, 232
Tell Nabasha 128, 151
Tell Sukas 114, 178
Tell Ziraʿa 99
Tharros 114
Thebes (Greece) 105
Thebes (Egypt) 114
Tiberias 129
Til Barsip 184
Tripoli 52
Tyre 5, 23, 43, 45, 52, 56f, 60, 120f, 150, 164, 168, 179, 196, 259–261
Ugarit 29f, 82, 84
Umm el-ʿAmad 189
Uruk 240
Wadi ed-Daliyeh 99, 101, 163, 179, 208, 256
Wadi Hammamat 114
Wadi Shuʿayb 82
Xanthos 7
Yatir 81
Yavneh 179f
Zeugma 240
Ẓur Natan 81

CONTRIBUTORS

Andrea M. Berlin, PhD
James R. Wiseman Chair in Classical Archaeology
Professor for Archaeology and Religion
Boston University, USA
aberlin@bu.edu

Philipp Frei, M.A. / M.A.
Classical and Near Eastern Archaeologist
Former staff member of the SNSF project „Die Bildwelt Palästinas/Israels zwischen Ost und West“
philippfrei@msn.com

Christian Frevel, Dr. theol.
Professor of Old Testament Studies
Department of Catholic Theology
Ruhr University Bochum, Germany
christian.frevel@rub.de

Sharon C. Herbert, PhD
Charles K. Williams, II Distinguished University Professor of Classical Archaeology Emerita
University of Michigan, USA
sherbert@umich.edu

Ulrich Hofeditz, Dr. phil.
Post-Doc Researcher
University of Mainz, Germany
hofeditu@uni-mainz.de

S. Rebecca Martin, PhD
Associate Professor of History of Art & Architecture and Archaeology
Boston University, USA
srmartin@bu.edu

Hans-Peter Mathys, Dr. theol.
Professor emeritus of Old Testament Studies and Semitic Languages
Faculty of Theology
University of Basel, Switzerland
hans-peter.mathys@unibas.ch

Katharina Pyschny, Dr. theol.
Professor of Old Testament Studies
Faculty of Catholic Theology
University of Graz, Austria
katharina.pyschny@uni-graz.at

Dalit Regev, PhD
Research Archaeologist
Israel Antiquities Authority, CA
dalit2005@yahoo.com

Silvia Schroer, Dr. theol.
Professor emerita of Old Testament Studies
Faculty of Theology
University of Bern, Switzerland
silvia.schroer@unibe.ch

Thomas Staubli, Dr. theol.
Senior Lecturer in Old Testament Studies
Faculty of Theology
University of Fribourg, Switzerland
thomas.staubli@unifr.ch

Rolf A. Stucky, Dr. phil.
Professor emeritus of Classical Archaeology
Department of Ancient Civilizations
University of Basel, Switzerland
rolf-a.stucky@unibas.ch

Patrick Wyssmann, Dr. theol.
Lecturer in Old Testament Studies
Faculty of Theology
University of Bern, Switzerland
patrick.wyssmann@unibe.ch

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

Bickel S., Schroer S., Schurte R., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Bilder als Quellen. Images as Sources. Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Artefacts and the Bible Inspired by the Work of Othmar Keel*, 2007, XLVI-560 p. + XXXIV pl.

25.1a Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band Ia: Der syrische Text der Edition in Estrangela. Faksimile des griechischen Papyrus Bodmer XI*, 1980, 64 p.

25.3 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band III: Forschungsgeschichtliche Bibliographie 1799-1984 mit kritischen Anmerkungen. Mit einem Beitrag von Majella Franzmann: A Study of the Odes of Solomon with Reference to French Scholarship 1909-1980*, 1986, XXXIV-478 p.

25.4 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band IV*, 1998, XII-272 p.

46 Hornung E., *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen. Dritte Auflage*, 1982, XII-133 p.

50.3 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*, 1992, CCXLII-1150 p.

50.4 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 4: Psaumes*, 2005, XLVIII-931 p.

50.5 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 5: Job, Proverbes, Qohélet et Cantique des Cantiques*, 2015, XXVIII-974 p.

55 Frei P., Koch K., *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich. Zweite, bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage*, 1996, 337 p.

61 Engel H., *Die Susanna-Erzählung. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung*, 1985, 205 p.

75 Schulman A.R., *Ceremonial Execution and Public Rewards. Some Historical Scenes on New Kingdom Private Stelae*, 1988, XXX-223 p. + 35 fig. + 6 pl.

77 Utzschneider H., *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz. Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Ex 25-40; Lev 8-9)*, 1988, XIV-320 p.

78 Gosse B., *Isaïe 13,1-14,23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d'Isaïe et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations*, 1988, 300 p.

81 Beyerlin W., *Bleilot, Brecheisen oder was sonst? Revision einer Amos-Vision*, 1988, 61 p.

82 Hutter M., *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 - KUB IX 34 - KBo XXI 6)*, 1988, 180 p.

85 Otto E., *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im «Bundesbuch». Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche und rechtsvergleichende Studie zu altbabylonischen und altisraelitischen Rechtsüberlieferungen*, 1989, IV-209 p.

89 Abitz F., *Baugeschichte und Dekoration des Grabes Ramses' VI.*, 1989, 196 p.

90 Henninger J., *Arabica Varia. Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Arabiens und seiner Randgebiete. Contributions à l'histoire culturelle de l'Arabie et de ses régions limitrophes*, 1989, 498 p.

92 O'Brien M.A., *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis. A Reassessment*, 1989, XIV-319 p.

94 Cortese E., *Josua 13-21. Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, 1990, VI-122 p.

96 **Wiese A.B.**, *Zum Bild des Königs auf ägyptischen Siegelamuletten*, 1990, XVI-207 p. + XXXII Taf.

98 **Schart A.**, *Mose und Israel im Konflikt. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Wüstenerzählungen*, 1990, VI-284 p.

100 **Keel O., Shuval M., Uehlinger C.**, *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band III: Die Frühe Eisenzeit. Ein Workshop*, 1990, XIV-458 p. + XXII Taf.

103 **Schenker A.**, *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien*, 1991, VIII-302 p.

105 **Osumi Y.**, *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b-23,33*, 1991, XII-273 p.

107 **Staubli T.**, *Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn*, 1991, XII-308 p. + 125 Abb.

109 **Norton G.J., Pisano S. (eds)**, *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, 1991, XII-310 p. + VII pl.

114 **Schneider T.**, *Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches*, 1992, XIV-482 p.

115 **von Nordheim E.**, *Die Selbstbehauptung Israels in der Welt des Alten Orients. Religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich anhand von Gen 15/22/28, dem Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten, 2 Sam 7, 1 Kön 19 und Psalm 104*, 1992, VI-220 p.

117 **Richards F.V.**, *Scarab Seals from a Middle to Late Bronze Age Tomb at Pella in Jordan*, 1992, XII-138 p. + XIII pl.

118 **Goldman Y.**, *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie*, 1992, XIV-259 p.

119 **Krapf T.M.**, *Die Priesterschrift und die vorexilische Zeit. Yehezkel Kaufmanns vernachlässigter Beitrag zur Geschichte der biblischen Religion*, 1992, XX-351 p.

123 **Zwickel W. (ed.)**, *Biblische Welten. Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, 1993, XII-248 p. + VIII Taf.

125 **Sass B., Uehlinger C. (eds)**, *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991*, 1993, XXIV-336 p.

126 **Bartelmus R., Krüger T., Utzschneider H. (eds)**, *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag*, 1993, X-401 p.

127 **Ivantchik A.I.**, *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*, 1993, 325 p.

128 **Voss J.**, *Die Menora. Gestalt und Funktion des Leuchters im Tempel zu Jerusalem*, 1993, 112 p.

131 **Burkert W., Stolz F. (eds)**, *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*, 1994, 123 p.

132 **Mathys H.-P.**, *Dichter und Beter. Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit*, 1994, X-374 p.

135 **Keel O.**, *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV. Mit Registern zu den Bänden I-IV*, 1994, XII-325 p. + 23 Taf.

136 **Stipp H.-J.**, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches. Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte*, 1994, VIII-186 p.

137 **Eschweiler P.**, *Bildzauber im alten Ägypten. Die Verwendung von Bildern und Gegenständen in magischen Handlungen nach den Texten des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches*, 1994, X-371 p. + XXVI Taf.

143 **Bieberstein K.**, *Josua - Jordan - Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1-6*, 1995, XII-483 p.

144 **Maier C.**, *Die «fremde Frau» in Proverbien 1-9. Eine exegetische und sozialgeschichtliche Studie*, 1995, XII-296 p.

145 **Steymans H.U.**, *Deuteronomium 28 und die «adê» zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*, 1995, XII-425 p.
146 **Abitz F.**, *Pharao als Gott in den Unterweltsbüchern des Neuen Reiches*, 1995, VIII-219 p.
148 **Bachmann M.**, *Die strukturalistische Artefakt- und Kunstanalyse. Exposition der Grundlagen anhand der vorderorientalischen, ägyptischen und griechischen Kunst*, 1996, 80 p.
150 **Staehelin E., Jaeger B. (eds)**, *Ägypten-Bilder. Akten des «Symposions zur Ägypten-Rezeption», Augst bei Basel, vom 9.-11. September 1993*, 1997, 383 p. + 96 Taf.
152 **Rossier F.**, *L'intercession entre les hommes dans la Bible hébraïque. L'intercession entre les hommes aux origines de l'intercession auprès de Dieu*, 1996, XIV-380 p.
153 **Kratz R.G., Krüger T. (eds)**, *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld. Ein Symposion aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Odil Hannes Steck*, 1997, 139 p.
154 **Bosshard-Nepustil E.**, *Rezeptionen von Jesaia 1-39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit*, 1997, XIV-521 p.
156 **Wagner A.**, *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*, 1997, VIII-199 p.
157 **Artus O.**, *Études sur le livre des Nombres. Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1-20,13*, 1997, X-298 p.
158 **Böhler D.**, *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras Alpha und Esra-Nehemia. Zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels*, 1997, XIV-435 p.
159 **Oswald W.**, *Israel am Gottesberg. Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19-24 und deren historischem Hintergrund*, 1998, X-286 p.
160.5 **Veenhof K.R., Eidem J.**, *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period. Annäherungen 5*, 2008, 382 p.
163 **Bietenhard S.K.**, *Des Königs General. Die Heerführertraditionen in der vorstaatlichen und frühen staatlichen Zeit und die Joabgestalt in 2 Sam 2-20; 1 Kön 1-2*, 1998, XIV-363 p.
164 **Braun J.**, *Die Musikkultur Altisraels/Palästinas. Studien zu archäologischen, schriftlichen und vergleichenden Quellen*, 1999, XII-388 p.
167 **Bollweg J.**, *Vorderasiatische Wagentypen im Spiegel der Terracottaplastik bis zur Altbabylonischen Zeit*, 1999, X-206 p.
168 **Rose M.**, *Rien de nouveau. Nouvelles approches du livre de Qohéleth. Avec une bibliographie (1988-1998) élaborée par Béatrice Perregaux Allison*, 1999, 629 p.
171 **Macchi J.-D.**, *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49*, 1999, XIV-380 p.
172 **Schenker A.**, *Recht und Kult im Alten Testament. Achtzehn Studien*, 2000, X-208 p.
173 **Theuer G.**, *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von KTU 1.24*, 2000, XVIII-657 p.
174 **Spieser C.**, *Les noms du Pharaon comme êtres autonomes au Nouvel Empire*, 2000, XII-398 p.
176 **de Pury A., Römer T. (eds)**, *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids. Neue Einsichten und Anfragen*, 2000, VI-189 p.
177 **Eggler J.**, *Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:2-14. The Research History from the End of the 19th Century to the Present*, 2000, VIII-143 p.
178 **Keel O., Staub U.**, *Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Studien zu Daniel 7 und zur Religionsnot unter Antiochus IV.*, 2000, XII-147 p.
179 **Goldman Y., Uehlinger C. (eds)**, *La double transmission du texte biblique. Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2001, VI-114 p.
180 **Zwingenberger U.**, *Dorfkultur der frühen Eisenzeit in Mittelpalästina*, 2001, XX-593 p.
181 **Tita H.**, *Gelübde als Bekenntnis. Eine Studie zu den Gelübden im Alten Testament*, 2001, XVI-251 p.

182 **Bosse-Griffiths K.,** *Amarna Studies and Other Selected Papers. Edited by J. Gwyn Griffiths*, 2001, IV-244 p.
183 **Reinmuth T.,** *Der Bericht Nehemias. Zur literarischen Eigenart, traditionsgeschichtliche Prägung und innerbiblischen Rezeption des Ich-Berichts Nehemias*, 2002, XIV-383 p.
184 **Herrmann C.,** *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel II*, 2002, XII-194 p.
185 **Roth S.,** *Gebieterin aller Länder. Die Rolle der königlichen Frauen in der fiktiven und realen Aussenpolitik des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*, 2002, XII-168 p.
186 **Hübner U., Knauf E.A. (eds),** *Kein Land für sich allein. Studien zum Kulturkontakt in Kanaan, Israel/Palästina und Ebirnâri für Manfred Weippert zum 65. Geburtstag*, 2002, VIII-331 p.
187 **Riede P.,** *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel*, 2002, XII-364 p.
188 **Schellenberg A.,** *Erkenntnis als Problem. Qohelet und die alttestamentliche Diskussion um das menschliche Erkennen*, 2002, XII-333 p.
189 **Meurer G.,** *Die Feinde des Königs in den Pyramiden-texten*, 2002, X-404 p.
190 **Maussion M.,** *Le mal, le bien et le jugement de Dieu dans le livre de Qohélet*, 2003, VIII-199 p.
192 **Koenen K.,** *Bethel. Geschichte, Kult und Theologie*, 2003, X-251 p.
193 **Junge F.,** *Die Lehre Ptahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, 2003, 286 p.
194 **Lefebvre J.-F.,** *Le jubilé biblique. Lv 25 - exégèse et théologie*, 2003, XII-443 p.
195 **Wettengel W.,** *Die Erzählung von den beiden Brüdern. Der Papyrus d'Orbiney und die Königsideologie der Ramessiden*, 2003, VI-301 p.
196 **Vonach A., Fischer G. (eds),** *Horizonte biblischer Texte. Festschrift für Josef M. Oesch zum 60. Geburtstag*, 2003, XII-316 p.
199 **Schenker A.,** *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher*, 2004, XXII-197 p.
200 **Keel-Leu H., Teissier B.,** *Die vorderasiatischen Rollsiegel der Sammlungen «Bibel+Orient» der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. The Ancient Near Eastern Cylinder Seals of the Collections «Bibel+Orient» of the University of Fribourg*, 2004, XXII-472 p.
201 **Alkier S., Witte M. (eds),** *Die Griechen und das antike Israel. Interdisziplinäre Studien zur Religions- und Kulturgeschichte des Heiligen Landes*, 2004, X-199 p.
202 **Sayed Mohamed Z.,** *Festvorbereitungen. Die administrativen und ökonomischen Grundlagen altägyptischer Feste*, 2004, XVI-185 p.
204 **Cornelius I.,** *The Many Faces of the Goddess. The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddesses Anat, Astarte, Qedeshet, and Asherah c. 1500-1000 BCE*, 2008, XVI-216 p. + 77 pl.
205 **Morenz L.D.,** *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen. Die Herausbildung der Schrift in der hohen Kultur Altägyptens*, 2004, XXII-373 p.
206 **Dietrich W. (ed.),** *David und Saul im Widerstreit - Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit. Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches*, 2004, 312 p.
207 **Himbaza I.,** *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte. Études des formes textuelles du Décalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, 2004, XIV-354 p.
208 **Isler-Kerényi C.,** *Civilizing Violence Satyrs on 6th-Century Greek Vases*, 2004, XII-123 p.
209 **Schipper B.U.,** *Die Erzählung des Wenamun. Ein Literaturwerk im Spannungsfeld von Politik, Geschichte und Religion*, 2005, XII-383 p. + XII Taf.
210 **Suter C.E., Uehlinger C. (eds),** *Crafts and Images in Contact. Studies on Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE*, 2005, XXXII-395 p. + LIV pl.
211 **Léonas A.,** *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*, 2005, X-340 p.

212 **Strawn B.A.**, *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 2005, XXX-587 p.

214 **Böhler D., Himbaza I., Hugo P. (eds)**, *L'Écrit et l'Esprit. Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2005, XXXII-472 p.

215 **O'Connell S.**, *From Most Ancient Sources. The Nature and Text-Critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible*, 2006, XII-178 p.

216 **Meyer-Dietrich E.**, *Senebi und Selbst. Personenkonstituenten zur rituellen Wiedergeburt in einem Frauensarg des Mittleren Reiches*, 2006, XII-438 p.

217 **Hugo P.**, *Les deux visages d'Élie. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18*, 2006, XXII-389 p.

218 **Zawadzki S.**, *Garments of the Gods. Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar according to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive*, 2006, XXIV-254 p.

219 **Knigge C.**, *Das Lob der Schöpfung. Die Entwicklung ägyptischer Sonnen- und Schöpfungshymnen nach dem Neuen Reich*, 2006, XII-365 p.

220 **Schroer S. (ed.)**, *Images and Gender. Contributions to the Hermeneutics of Reading Ancient Art*, 2006, 383 p. + 29 pl.

221 **Stark C.**, *«Kultprostitution» im Alten Testament? Die Qedeschen der Hebräischen Bibel und das Motiv der Hurerei*, 2006, X-249 p.

222 **Pruin D.**, *Geschichten und Geschichte. Isebel als literarische und historische Gestalt*, 2006, XII-398 p.

223 **Coulange P.**, *Dieu, ami des pauvres. Étude sur la connivence entre le Très-Haut et les petits*, 2007, XVI-282 p.

224 **Wagner A. (ed.)**, *Parallelismus membrorum*, 2007, VIII-300 p.

225 **Herrmann C.**, *Formen für ägyptische Fayencen aus Qantir. Band II: Katalog der Sammlung des Franciscan Biblical Museum, Jerusalem und zweier Privatsammlungen*, 2007, X-125 p. + XXIX Taf.

226 **Heise J.**, *Erinnern und Gedenken. Aspekte der biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, 2007, IV-385 p.

227 **Frey-Anthes H.**, *Unheilsmächte und Schutzgenien, Antiwesen und Grenzgänger. Vorstellungen von «Dämonen» im alten Israel*, 2007, XIV-363 p.

228 **Becking B.**, *From David to Gedaliah. The Book of Kings as Story and History*, 2007, XII-227 p.

229 **Dubiel U.**, *Amulette, Siegel und Perlen. Studien zu Typologie und Tragsitte im Alten und Mittleren Reich*, 2008, XVI-270 p. + XVIII Taf.

230 **Giovino M.**, *The Assyrian Sacred Tree. A History of Interpretations*, 2007, VIII-242 p. + 107 fig.

231 **Kübel P.**, *Metamorphosen der Paradieserzählung*, 2007, X-238 p.

232 **Paz S.**, *Drums, Women, and Goddesses. Drumming and Gender in Iron Age II Israel*, 2007, XII-143 p.

233 **Himbaza I., Schenker A. (eds)**, *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible. Du texte à la théologie au IIe siècle avant J.-C.*, 2007, X-151 p.

234 **Tavares R.**, *Eine königliche Weisheitslehre? Exegetische Analyse von Sprüche 28-29 und Vergleich mit den ägyptischen Lehren Merikaras und Amenemhats*, 2007, XIV-306 p.

235 **Witte M., Diehl J.F. (eds)**, *Israeliten und Phönizier. Ihre Beziehungen im Spiegel der Archäologie und der Literatur des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, 2008, VIII-295 p.

236 **Müller-Roth M.**, *Das Buch vom Tage*, 2008, XII-603 p. + XXIX Taf.

237 **Sowada K.N.**, *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom. An Archaeological Perspective*, 2009, XXIV-309 p. + 48 fig. + 19 pl.

238 **Kraus W., Munnich O. (eds)**, *La Septante en Allemagne et en France. Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie. Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale. Texte der Septuaginta in Doppelüberlieferung oder in wörtlicher Übersetzung*, 2009, XII-307 p.

239 **Mittermayer C.**, *Enmerkara und der Herr von Arata. Ein ungleicher Wettstreit*, 2009, VIII-386 p. + XIX Taf.

240 **Waraksa E.A.**, *Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct. Context and Ritual Function*, 2009, XII-246 p.

241 **Ben-Shlomo D.**, *Philistine Iconography. A Wealth of Style and Symbolism*, 2010, X-232 p.

242 **LeMon J.M.**, *Yahweh's Winged Form in the Psalms. Exploring Congruent Iconography and Texts*, 2010, XIV-231 p.

243 **El Hawary A.**, *Wortschöpfung. Die Memphitische Theologie und die Siegesstele des Pije – zwei Zeugen kultureller Repräsentation in der 25. Dynastie*, 2010, XII-499 p. + XXIV pl.

244 **Wälchli S.H.**, *Gottes Zorn in den Psalmen. Eine Studie zur Rede vom Zorn Gottes in den Psalmen im Kontext des Alten Testamentes und des Alten Orients*, 2012, VIII-191 p.

245 **Steymans H.U. (ed.)**, *Gilgamesch : Ikonographie eines Helden. Gilgamesh : Epic and Iconography*, 2010, XII-452 p.

246 **Petter D.L.**, *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments*, 2011, XVI-198 p.

247 **Fischer E.**, *Tell el-Far'ah (Süd). Ägyptisch-levantinische Beziehungen im späten 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 2011, X-430 p.

248 **Petit T.**, *Œdipe et le Chérubin. Les sphinx levantins, cypriotes et grecs comme gardiens d'Immortalité*, 2011, X-291 p. + 191 fig.

249 **Dietrich W. (ed.)**, *Seitenblicke. Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch*, 2011, 459 p.

250 **Durand J.-M., Römer T., Langlois M. (eds)**, *Le jeune héros : Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien. Actes du colloque organisé par les chaires d'Assyriologie et des Milieux bibliques du Collège de France, Paris, les 6 et 7 avril 2009*, 2011, VI-360 p.

251 **Jaques M. (ed.)**, *Klagetraditionen. Form und Funktion der Klage in den Kulturen der Antike*, 2011, VIII-110 p.

252 **Langlois M.**, *Le texte de Josué 10. Approche philologique, épigraphique et diachronique*, 2011, 266 p.

253 **Béré P.**, *Le second Serviteur de Yhwh. Un portrait exégétique de Josué dans le livre éponyme*, 2012, XVI-275 p.

254 **Kilunga B.**, *Prééminence de YHWH ou autonomie du prophète. Étude comparative et critique des confessions de Jérémie dans le texte hébreu massorétique et la «Septante»*, 2011, XVI-216 p.

255 **Gruber M., Ahituv S., Lehmann G., Talshir Z. (eds)**, *All the Wisdom of the East. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren*, 2012, XXVIII-475-85* p.

256 **Mittermayer C., Ecklin S. (eds)**, *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*, 2012, XVIII-452 p.

257 **Durand J.-M., Römer T., Hutzli J. (eds)**, *Les vivants et leurs morts. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 14-15 avril 2010*, 2012, X-287 p.

258 **Thompson R.J.**, *Terror of the Radiance. Aššur Covenant to YHWH Covenant*, 2013, X-260 p.

259 **Asher-Greve J.M., Westenholz J.G.**, *Goddesses in Context. On Divine Powers, Roles, Relationships and Gender in Mesopotamian Textual and Visual Sources*, 2013, XII-454 p.

260 **Zawadzki S.**, *Garments of the Gods. Vol. 2: Texts*, 2013, XIV-743 p.

261 **Braun-Holzinger E.A.**, *Frühe Götterdarstellungen in Mesopotamien*, 2013, X-238 p. + 46 pl.

263 **Sugimoto D.T. (ed.)**, *Transformation of a Goddess: Ishtar - Astarte - Aphrodite*, 2014, XIV-228 p.

264 **Morenz L.D.**, *Anfänge der ägyptischen Kunst. Eine problemgeschichtliche Einführung in ägyptologische Bild-Anthropologie*, 2014, XVIII-257 p.

265 **Durand J.-M., Römer T., Bürki M. (eds)**, *Comment devient-on prophète? Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 4-5 avril 2011*, 2014, XII-223 p.

266 **Michel P.M.**, *La culte des pierres à Emar à l'époque hittite*, 2014, VIII-312 p.

267 **Frevel C., Pyschny K., Cornelius I. (eds)**, *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case*, 2014, X-440 p.

268 **Bleibtreu E., Steymans H.U. (eds)**, *Edith Porada zum 100. Geburtstag. A Centenary Volume*, 2014, XVI-642 p.

269 **Lohwasser A. (ed.)**, *Skarabäen des 1. Jahrtausends. Ein Workshop in Münster am 27. Oktober 2012*, 2014, VI-200 p.

270 **Wagner A. (ed.)**, *Göttliche Körper - Göttliche Gefühle. Was leisten anthropomorphe und anhropopathische Götterkonzepte im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament?*, 2014, X-273 p.

271 **Heintz J.-G.**, *Prophétisme et Alliance. Des Archives royales de Mari à la Bible hébraïque*, 2015, XXXVI-373 p.

272 **von der Osten-Sacken E.**, *Untersuchungen zur Geflügelwirtschaft im Alten Orient*, 2015, XVI-670 p.

273 **Jaques M.**, *Mon dieu qu'ai-je fait? Les diĝir-šà-dab$_{(5)}$-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie*, 2015, XIV-463 p.

274 **Durand J.-M., Guichard M., Römer T. (eds)**, *Tabou et transgressions. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 11-12 avril 2012*, 2015, XII-314 p.

275 **Himbaza I. (ed.)**, *Making the Biblical Text. Textual Studies in the Hebrew and the Greek Bible*, 2015, XIV-192 p.

276 **Schmid K., Uehlinger C. (eds)**, *Laws of Heaven - Laws of Nature: Legal Interpretations of Cosmic Phenomena in the Ancient World. Himmelsgesetze - Naturgesetze: Rechtsförmige Interpretationen kosmischer Phänomene in der antiken Welt*, 2016, X-177 p.

277 **Wasmuth M. (ed.)**, *Handel als Medium von Kulturkontakt. Akten des interdisziplinären altertumswissenschaftlichen Kolloquiums (Basel, 30.-31. Oktober 2009)*, 2015, VIII-175 p.

278 **Durand J.-M., Marti L., Römer T. (eds)**, *Colères et repentirs divins. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 24 et 25 avril 2013*, 2015, X-393 p.

279 **Schütte W.**, *Israels Exil in Juda. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der Schriftprophetie*, 2016, X-270 p.

280 **Bonfiglio R.P.**, *Reading Images, Seeing Texts. Towards a Visual Hermeneutics for Biblical Studies*, 2016, XIV-364 p.

281 **Rückl J.**, *A Sure House. Studies on the Dynastic Promise to David in the Books of Samuel and Kings*, 2016, VIII-356 p.

282 **Schroer S., Münger S. (eds)**, *Khirbet Qeiyafa in the Shephelah. Papers Presented at a Colloquium of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies Held at the University of Bern, September 6, 2014*, 2017, IV-168 p.

283 **Jindo J.Y., Sommer B.D., Staubli T. (eds)**, *Yehezkel Kaufmann and the Reinvention of Jewish Biblical Scholarship*, 2017, XVIII-376 p.

284 **Nocquet D.R.**, *La Samarie, la Diaspora et l'achèvement de la Torah. Territorialités et internationalités dans l'Hexateuque*, 2017, X-354 p.

285 **Kipfer S. (ed.),** *Visualizing Emotions in the Ancient Near East*, 2017, VIII-294 p.
286 **Römer T., Dufour B., Pfitzmann F., Uehlinger C. (eds),** *Entre dieux et hommes : anges, démons et autres figures intermédiaires. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 19 et 20 mai 2014*, 2017, XII-367 p.
287 **Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L. (eds),** *Représenter dieux et hommes dans le Proche-Orient ancien et dans la Bible. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 5 et 6 mai 2015,* 2019, XII-386 p.
288 **Wyssmann P.,** *Vielfältig geprägt. Das spätperserzeitliche Samaria und seine Münzbilder,* 2019, XII-368 p.
289 **Anthonioz S., Mouton A., Petit D. (eds),** *When Gods Speak to Men. Divine Speech according to Textual Sources in the Ancient Mediterranean Basin,* 2019, X-138 p.
290 **Wasserman N.,** *The Flood : The Akkadian Sources. A New Edition, Commentary and a Literary Discussion*, 2020, X-187 p.
291 **Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L., Rückl J. (eds),** *Oral et écrit dans l'Antiquité orientale : les processus de rédaction et d'édition. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 26 et 27 mai 2016*, 2021, XIV-345 p.
292 **Himbaza I. (ed.),** *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015)*, 2020, XII-278 p.
293 **Galoppin T., Bonnet C. (eds),** *Divine Names on the Spot. Towards a Dynamic Approach of Divine Denominations in Greek and Semitic Contexts*, 2021, VIII-256 p.
294 **Muraoka T.,** *The Books of Hosea and Micah in Hebrew and Greek*, 2022, XIV-277 p.
295 **Payne A., Velhartická Š., Wintjes J. (eds),** *Beyond All Boundaries. Anatolia in the First Millennium BC*, 2021, XVI-763 p.
296 **Bachmann V., Schellenberg A., Ueberschaer F. (eds),** *Menschsein in Weisheit und Freiheit. Festschrift für Thomas Krüger*, 2022, X-603 p.
297 **Walker J.,** *The Power of Images. The Poetics of Violence in Lamentations 2 and Ancient Near Eastern Art*, 2022, X-322 p.
298 **Porzia F.,** *Le peuple aux trois noms. Une histoire de l'ancien Israël à travers le prisme de ses ethnonymes*, 2022, XII-406 p.
299 **Porzia F., Bonnet C. (eds),** *Divine Names on the Spot II. Exploring the Potentials of Names through Images and Narratives*, 2023, VIII-333 p.
300 **Lenzi A.,** *Suffering in Babylon. Ludlul bēl nēmeqi and the Scholars, Ancient and Modern*, 2023, XIV-513 p.
301 **Howard J.C. (ed.),** *Architecture, Iconography, and Text. New Studies on the Northwest Palace Reliefs of Ashurnasirpal II*, 2023, VIII-191 p.
302 **Muraoka T.,** *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 2023, XIV-807 p.
303 **Münger S., Rahn N., Wyssmann P. (eds),** *„Trinkt von dem Wein, den ich mischte!" "Drink of the Wine which I have Mingled!" Festschrift für Silvia Schroer zum 65. Geburtstag*, 2023, XII-632 p.
304 **Muraoka T.,** *The Wisdom of Solomon in the Septuagint*, 2024, XII-228 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SERIES ARCHAEOLOGICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

1 **Briend J., Humbert J.-B. (eds),** *Tell Keisan (1971-1976), une cité phénicienne en Galilée*, 1980, XXXVIII-392 p. + 142 pl.

5 **Müller-Winkler C.,** *Die ägyptischen Objekt-Amulette. Mit Publikation der Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz, ehemals Sammlung Fouad S. Matouk*, 1987, 590 p. + XL Taf.

12 **Wiese A.B.,** *Die Anfänge der ägyptischen Stempelsiegel-Amulette. Eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den «Knopfsiegeln» und verwandten Objekten der 6. bis frühen 12. Dynastie*, 1996, XXII-194 p. + 93 Taf.

14 **Amiet P., Briend J., Courtois L., Dumortier J.-B.,** *Tell el Far'ah. Histoire, glyptique et céramologie*, 1996, IV-91 p.

18 **Nunn A.,** *Die figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordaniens vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, 2000, XII-269 p. + 78 Taf.

19 **Bignasca A.M.,** *I kernoi circolari in Oriente e in Occidente. Strumenti di culto e immagini cosmiche*, 2000, XII-324 p.

20 **Beyer D.,** *Emar IV: Les Sceaux. Mission archéologique de Meskéné-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Aštata*, 2001, XXII-490 p. + 50 pl.

21 **Wäfler M.,** *Tall al-Ḥamīdīya 3: Zur historischen Geographie von Idamaraṣ zur Zeit der Archive von Mari$_{(2)}$ und Šubat-enlil/Šeḫnā*, 2001, 298 p. + 14 maps

22 **Herrmann C.,** *Die ägyptischen Amulette der Sammlungen BIBEL+ORIENT der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. Anthropomorphe Gestalten und Tiere*, 2003, X-291 p.

23 **Wäfler M.,** *Tall al-Ḥamīdīya 4: Vorbericht 1988-2001*, 2003, 253 p. + 8 Pläne

24 **Herrmann C.,** *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band III*, 2006, XII-359 p.

25 **Eggler J., Keel O.,** *Corpus der Siegel-Amulette aus Jordanien. Vom Neolithikum bis zur Perserzeit*, 2006, XVIII-510 p.

26 **Kaelin O.,** *«Modell Ägypten». Adoption von Innovationen im Mesopotamien des 3. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, 2006, 204 p.

27 **Ben-Tor D.,** *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections. Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period*, 2007, XVI-211 p. + 109 pl.

28 **Meyer J.-W.,** *Die eisenzeitlichen Stempelsiegel aus dem 'Amuq-Gebiet. Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie altorientalischer Siegelbilder*, 2008, X-655 p.

29 **Keel O.,** *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel Eton*, 2010, XIV-642 p.

30 **Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W.,** *Yavneh I: The Excavation of the 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit and the Cult Stands*, 2010, XII-297 p. + 176 pl.

31 **Keel O.,** *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band III: Von Tell el-Far'a Nord bis Tell el-Fir*, 2010, VI-461 p.

32 **Rohn K.,** *Beschriftete mesopotamische Siegel der Frühdynastischen und der Akkad-Zeit*, 2011, XIV-385 p. + 66 pl.

33 **Keel O.,** *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band IV: Von Tel Gamma bis Chirbet Husche*, 2013, XVI-715 p.

34 **Golani A.,** *Jewelry from the Iron Age II Levant*, 2013, XII-313 p.

35 **Keel O.,** *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band V: Von Tel el-'Idham bis Tel Kitan*, 2017, XVIII-672 p.

36 **Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W.,** *Yavneh II: The 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit*, 2015, XIV-288 p. + 63 pl.

37 **Choi G.D.,** *Decoding Canaanite Pottery Paintings from the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I. Classification and Analysis of Decorative Motifs and Design Structures - Statistics, Distribution Patterns - Cultural and Socio-Political Implications*, 2016, XII-272 p. + CD.

38 **Herrmann C.,** *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV: Von der Spätbronzezeit IIB bis in römische Zeit*, 2016, XVI-510 p.

39 **Keel O.,** *700 Skarabäen und Verwandtes aus Palästina/Israel. Die Sammlung Keel*, 2020, XX-319 p.

40 **Attinger P., Cavigneaux A., Mittermayer C., Novák M. (eds),** *Text and Image. Proceedings of the 61e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Geneva and Bern, 22-26 June 2015*, 2018, XXIV-526 p.

41 **Ahrens A.,** *Aegyptiaca in der nördlichen Levante. Eine Studie zur Kontextualisierung und Rezeption ägyptischer und ägyptisierender Objekte in der Bronzezeit*, 2020, XX-451 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SUBSIDIA LINGUISTICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

1 **Van Damme D.,** *Altarmenische Kurzgrammatik*, 2004, X-149 p.